A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE COPTIC GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS

By

Archie L. Nations

Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
Religion

August, 1960
Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:	Date:
Leander E Keck	August 5, 1960
Walter Harrelson	August 5, 1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I. TEXTUAL STUDY

Chapter

I. TRANSLATION OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS, WITH CRITICAL NOTES. 11

Preface to the Translation
Translation

II. THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS AND THE OXYRYNCHUS PAPYRI 57

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 654
Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1
Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 655

PART II. SITZ IM LEBEN

III. LITERARY GENRE AND RELATIONSHIPS TO SECOND AND THIRD CENTURY LITERATURE 89

The Structure of the Collection
The Collection as a Gospel
Three Questions
Type of Literature and Usage in the Community
Literary and Sectarian Connections

IV. THE USE OF CANONICAL SAYINGS AND NEW AGRAPHA. 146

The Canonical Sayings in the *Gospel of Thomas*
The Use and Interpretation of New Parables
  and Sayings

PART III. RELATION TO GNOSTICISM

V. GNOSTIC TERMS AND SYMBOLS. 199

From "Ignorance" to "Knowledge"
Evidences of Dualism
The Concept of Knowledge

Page
VI. THEOLOGY IN THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS 231

Cosmology
Anthropology, Salvation, and Eschatology
Conception of the Kingdom
Conception of Jesus

CONCLUSION 266

APPENDIX A 280

APPENDIX B 286

BIBLIOGRAPHY 291

INTRODUCTION

Until very recent times the sources for the study of Christian Gnosticism have been severely limited. Historians have had to depend primarily upon the writings of the early church fathers, and, because of their orthodox bias and polemical method, we may suspect that they do not always present as true a picture of the heretics as we should like to have. Since 1945, however, a whole Gnostic library has come to light from the dry sands of Egypt. Competent authorities consider this happy find to be of far greater worth than the Dead Sea Scrolls. Although the Gnostic library may not illuminate the problem of Christian origins, it is of very great moment with respect to the development of Christian Gnosticism in the second and third centuries. Jean Doresse seems to know more about the entire library than any other scholar. He writes:

> Peut-être ai-je un peu tendance à sous-estimer l'interet des prestigieux manuscrits découverts pres de la Mer Morte? Je ne veux point prétendre par cela que je leur refuse toute l'importance que les spécialistes les plus compétents s'accordent à leur reconnaître. Mais je ne vais pas jusqu'à penser qu'ils représentent la plus extraordinaire découverte que l'on puisse faire sur le passé dans lequel le Christianisme est né et a grandi. J'ai, à cela, une raison personnelle assez valable: je connais d'autres écrits, un peu moins anciens (à quelques siècles près) que les textes de Qoumrân, mais plus riches, et qui illustrent avec une extrême abondance de détails un des côtès les plus obscurs de ces premiers siècles

de notre ère.[1]

Doresse has made the only direct and complete inventory of the volumes in possession of the Coptic Museum in Cairo and has given an account of the discovery of the Gnostic library and a summary of his findings concerning its nature and extent.[2]

It is said that the library was found in a jar about 1945 by some peasants digging for sebakh (a natural fertilizer), at the foot of the mountain Gebel et-Tarif in a pagan cemetery dating from the Greek and Roman periods. This is in the proximity of Chenoboskion and Nag-Hammadi, downstream on the Nile about 100 kilometers from Luxor. Not knowing the enormous value of the papyrus documents, the peasants sold them to private collectors for a ridiculously low sum. One volume found its way into the hands of a private individual from whom it escaped to Europe, traversed the Atlantic and back, and was eventually purchased by the Jung Institute of Zurich. Of this so-called Jung Codex[3] one of the five titles contained in it has been published, the Evangelium Veritatis,[4] purportedly by the heretic Valentinus. One volume of the library was purchased from a vendor by Togo Mina, director of the Coptic Museum. The first announcement of the discovery was made in the Egyptian press on January 11 and 12, 1948.

---

[1] Jean Doresse, Les Livres Secrets des Gnostiques D'Egypte (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1958), p. 1.

[2] Ibid.

[3] F. L. Cross (ed.), The Jung Codex, a newly recovered Gnostic papyrus (London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, Limited, 1955).

[4] Evangelium Veritatis, Codex Jung, ed. and trans. Michel Malinine, Henri-Charles Puech, and Gilles Quispel (Zurich: Rascher Verlag, 1956).

Soon thereafter it became known that a private individual in Cairo possessed other manuscripts. Upon examination, they proved to be of the same library and offered some forty new writings in addition to the ones already known. It was now clear that thirteen papyrus codices comprised the library which had been accidentally discovered by the illiterate peasants. Eleven of the codices were still intact with their bindings. Two were represented only by some scattered pages. In all there were forty-nine titles, although with the duplicate copies of some of the treatises there were actually forty-four works. Most of these were previously unknown or known only by name. The majority of the manuscripts were written in the Sahidic dialect of Upper Egypt, the most importnat literary dialect of the Copts. There are occasional peculiarities of the Achmimic and Subachmimic dialects of Middle Egypt mixed in the manuscripts. Only the Codex Jung (No. XIII of Doresse's inventory)[1] and the treatise entitled The Interpretation of the Gnosis (the first text of No. VIII in Doresse's inventory) were written in the Subachmimic dialect.[1]

---

[1] Not all of No. XIII escaped to Europe. Some 23 pages came into the possession of the Coptic Museum along with the other manuscripts.

Various unfortunate events, such as the death of Togo Mina, the uncertainty of political conditions (the Egyptian revolution among them), and problems relating to the acquisition of the volumes by the Coptic Museum have delayed the publication of the manuscripts. To the present time only one of the volumes (aside from Evangelium Veritatis of the Codex Jung) has been published in photographic facsimile. It is Codex No. X, which Doresse describes as "Le plus beau et le plus volumineux des manuscrits."[2] In 1956, Pahor Labib, the new director of the Coptic Museum, edited and published No. X.[3] It was in this rather poor photographic reproduction that the Gospel according to Thomas first became available to the scholarly world. Since copies of Labib's edition were not readily available at the outset, and since few western scholars read Coptic, Thomas only gradually became known. During the past two years, however, it has excited considerable attention both on the part of theologians and the general public. It has been termed the most important single work of the entire Chenoboskion find.

One readily discerns the significance of Thomas even with a casual reading of the text. Here is a collection of 115 sayings attributed to Jesus, with no narrative framework.

---

[1] Doresse, op. cit., pp. 160-67.

[2] Ibid., p. 167.

[3] Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo, ed. Pahor Labib (Cairo: Government Press, 1956), I.

Many of them are very close to parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels, but frequently with interesting differences. A few others are Johannine in tone. Some have a Synoptic stamp upon them but are entirely new to us. Many others are clearly syncretistic, Gnostic fabrications put into the mouth of Jesus. Questions burst forth immediately once these basic characteristics are seen. What is the relation of the collection to our New Testament, and especially to the canonical Gospels? Do we have in Thomas a sayings-tradition from Jesus Himself which has somehow escaped the New Testament? What of the portrait of Jesus given in the work? Is the collection homogeneous enough to define its essential, overall character, or is it widely disparate in the various elements which it includes so that it must be dealt with mainly as a mosaic of sayings, each (or each classification) of which must be analyzed separately? Does it have any bearing upon the textual criticism of the New Testament? What relationship does it have to other literature, mainly that later than the New Testament and coming from the second and third centuries? What may we learn from the patristic references to the Gospel of Thomas? Do any other copies or fragments of the same work exist with which it may be compared? Out of what type of environment did it arise, and in what milieu was it made use of? Is it really a Gnostic production, or only semi-Gnostic? In what respects may it modify our understanding of Gnosticism, if any? What does it show relative to the attempts of some Christians to reinterpret the Christian message in terms of their cultural situation? Does it contain any reminiscences of an early, Jewish-type Christian community? Does the community of Thomas have any relation to the Qumran community, the Essenes, or the Therapeutae of Philo? What is the date of Thomas? Among others these are some of the issues raised by the Gospel of Thomas.

Obviously not all the problems can be solved in one research project; consequently, we must be selective in order to be productive. Part I of this thesis consists of a basic textual study. Chapter I is a translation of the work made directly from the Coptic text. The reader is thus given access to the document by means of an English translation to which abundant critical notes are subjoined. This is an absolutely necessary step toward clearing away the multitude of problems. Unless problems of translation are noted, alternate renditions given, and occasionally conjectures made with regard to the underlying Greek text, the interpreter or commentator may easily go far afield in his attempt to explain the sayings historically, exegetically, and theologically. Chapter II deals with the extant Greek fragments of the Gospel of Thomas, namely, Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1, 654, and 655.[1] The comparative study and reconstruction given there is important for the date of Thomas and the textual history of the work. The evidence also leads us to consider the attitude and manner in which the religious community made use of the document. In Part II we shall be concerned with the context or the life situation ("Sitz im Leben") in which the collection arose and wherein and how it was employed. Chapter III deals with the literary genre of the work and its relationship to second and third century literature. This part of the study assists us in defining the essential perspective of the religious community and its theological position in relation to the orthodox church of the time. The meaning especially of the syncretistic sayings is clarified. Chapter IV entails an analysis of the more important parallels to canonical sayings and the extra-canonical agrapha of the Synoptic or Semitic style. Here we are given an understanding of the relationship of the collection as a literary document to the canonical literature of the New Testament in general and of the Synoptic Gospels in particular. The community's attitude toward canonical tradition also comes forth. This together with the method of handling the canonical tradition better enables us to see how this category of sayings was understood by the group. Part III concerns the relation of Thomas to Gnosticism, or the Gnostic character of the work as a whole. In Chapter V leading Gnostic terms and symbols shall occupy our attention. The findings of this chapter are extremely suggestive for the theological exposition of the document, which follows in Chapter VI. The theology of Thomas interests the modern reader as a demonstration of how a particular Gnostic community understood theological conceptions of Biblical provenance--cosmology, anthropology, salvation, eschatology, the kingdom of God, and Jesus the Redeemer. Unusually important from our point of view are the rather peculiar Christological ideas of Thomas.

---

[1] The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ed. and trans. Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898 and 1904), I and IV.

While no apology is given for the nature and structure of the present work, we are compelled to confess its preliminary character. This is necessarily true in the early stages of research upon a document like the Gospel of Thomas. We await the publication of a detailed, exhaustive commentary of the entire collection, which may best be done by several competent scholars in the field. It is to be hoped that this thesis may give a forward thrust to the investigation now going on. What are considered to be distinctive contributions will be pointed out along the way where it is felt to be necessary. Elsewhere such will become apparent by a comparison with other works in the field. Many questions remain unanswered; numerous problems are yet to be dealt with. Areas for further study will be indicated in the conclusion.

Concerning technical matters, some use has been made of the signs from Nestle's critical edition of the Greek New

Testament.[1] The following abbreviations also occur here and there:

A = Achmimic dialect (of Middle Egypt)
A^2 = Subachmimic dialect (of Middle Egypt)
S = Sahidic dialect (of Upper Egypt)
G. Th. = *Gospel of Thomas*
Pat. Gr. = *Patrologiae Graeca*

Unless otherwise indicated, the citations in English translation from the church Fathers have been taken from the edition of Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson.[2] Similarly, the citations from the Fathers in Greek are from the edition of J. P. Migne,[3] unless shown differently in the footnotes.

---

[1] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle (21st ed.; Stuttgart: Privileg. Wurtt. Bibelanstalt, 1952), pp. 59-84.

[2] *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (9 vols.; American Reprint of the Edinburgh Edition; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951 and 1956).

[3] *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne (161 vols.; Lutetia Parisiorum, 1857-66).

PART I. TEXTUAL STUDY

CHAPTER I

TRANSLATION OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS, WITH CRITICAL NOTES

Preface to the Translation

The following translation has been made directly from the Coptic text. The initial work was based upon the photographic edition of one volume[1] of the Chenoboskion library. This edition leaves much to be desired in that it is a very poor facsimile of the original. In some measure the deficiency has been abolished by the more recent edition of a group of European scholars,[2] who have published the printed text and the English translation on opposite pages. Their transcribed text is reported to have been made from superior infrared photographic plates of the original manuscript. In some respects the translation given here has been corrected by the use of this edition, especially where a reading is blurred or where the editors have given what seems to be a well-founded conjecture. Wherever such dependence occurs it is recorded in the footnotes. The accompanying translation has also been helpful at certain points. Three other translations[1] have been consulted in the process of preparation and correction. The work is, nevertheless, not a slavish imitation of any of these, although occasional dependence upon one or several of them is in evidence. The translation is the product of much reflection upon various possible renditions of the text; frequently the parentheses and footnotes suggest alternate translations.

---

[1] _Coptic Gnostic Papyri . . ._, I.

[2] _The Gospel according to Thomas_, ed. and trans. A. Guillaumont, Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, Walter Till, and Yassah Abd Al Masiḥ (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959).

The Gospel of Thomas is found on Plates 80-99, according to the numbering of the leaves of the volume edited by Labib.[2] The size of the pages in the codex is 21 X 27 cm., and it is bound in leather. There are thirty-four or thirty-five lines to each plate, with about twenty-five to twenty-seven letters per line. The handwriting is a large uncial type, fairly well formed throughout. More than one scribe seems to have been responsible for the copy. For the most part the document is in good condition. Some lacunae appear at the top and bottom of some of the leaves, along with numerous faded or blurred letters. Many of the gaps may be filled in rather easily, while others continue to be a mystery.

---

[1] That of William R. Schoedel in Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman, The Secret Sayings of Jesus (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1960), pp. 117-98; Johannes Leipoldt, "Ein neues Evangelium?" Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXIII (July, 1958), cols. 482-95; The Coptic Gospel of Thomas, A Gnostic Source of Unknown Sayings of Jesus from Chenoboskion, an English translation prepared by the New Testament Seminar of Princeton Theological Seminary (May, 1958). This last work was secured from Professor Otto A. Piper of Princeton Theological Seminary. Hereafter it will be referred to as Princeton Translation.

[2] Coptic Gnostic Papyri . . . , I.

The numbering of the sayings differs from that of the other translations that are given; that is, at certain points. This is not without reason. Occasionally there may be doubt whether a division should be made; yet, the numbering given here is as valid as any other and is based upon painstaking study of the text. In the body of the text at the center of the page the successive sayings are indicated by Arabic numerals, beside which are given in parentheses the exact locations of the sayings according to plate and line numbers. Hence, 2(80:19-81:5) indicates Saying 2, which is found on Plate 80, line 19 through Plate 81, line 5, of the Labib edition. The many Greek words that appear in the Coptic version are enclosed in parentheses in the translation as the scribes wrote them. The following standard signs have been utilized in the translation where needed:

[. . . .]	Lacuna in the text; number of dots = the approximate number of missing letters.
[ ]	Conjectural restoration within a lacuna.
( )	Translator's addition or query (with question mark) to facilitate understanding in English.
< >	Error of the scribe (a dittography, for example, as at 96:23).
***	Inadvertent omission by the scribe.
cj.	Conjectural emendation of the Coptic text.
(( ))	Suspected interpolation.

// = Parallel to.

The footnotes consist primarily of Biblical parallels, problems of grammar and translation, and manuscript peculiarities.

TRANSLATION

Preface (80:10-14)

These are the secret words which the Living Jesus spoke and which Didymus-Judas-Thomas recorded. And He (Jesus) said, "He who finds the interpretation (ΕΘΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ) of these words shall not taste death."

1. (80:14-19)

Jesus said, "Let not him who seeks cease seeking until he finds,[1] and whenever (ϩΟΤΑΝ) he finds he will be disturbed, and whenever he is disturbed he will be amazed, and he will become ruler over all" (the All?).

2. (80:19-81:5)

Jesus said, "If those who lead you say to you, 'Lo, the kingdom is in the sky,' then the birds of the sky will precede you. If they say to you, 'It is in the sea' (ΘΑΛΑΣΣΑ), then the fish will precede you. But (ΑΛΛΑ) the kingdom is in your interior and in your exterior.[2] Whenever (ϩΟΤΑΝ) you know yourselves, then (ΤΟΤΕ) you will be known, and you will understand that you are the sons of the Living Father. But (ΔΕ) if you do not know yourselves, then you are in poverty, and you are poverty."

---

[1] 80:9 appears to have an erasure of about eleven letters, probably due to a scribal error. The part of the papyrus thus scraped could not be written upon again. Cf. Mt. 7:7b; Lk. 11:9b.

[2] Cf. Lk. 17:21.

3. (81:5-10)

Jesus said, "The man (who is) old in his days will not hesitate to ask a little child who is seven days old about the place (ΤΟΠΟΣ) of Life, and he[1] shall live; for there are many first who shall be last, and they (the first and last? or the many first?) shall be one only."[2]

4. (81:10-14)

Jesus said, "Know Him (Jesus?) who is before your face; and Him (God?) who is hidden from you, He (Jesus?) will reveal to you. For (ΓΑΡ) there is nothing hidden which will not be revealed."[3]

5. (81:14-23)

His disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) questioned him, they said to him, "Do you want us to fast (ΝΗΣΤΈΥΕ)? and how should we pray and give alms (ΕΛΕΗΜΟΣΥΝΗ)? and what should we scrupulously observe (ΠΑΡΑΤΗΡΕΙ), that is, eat?" Jesus said, "Do not lie, and what you hate do not do, because all things are manifest (exposed) before Heaven (God?). For (ΓΑΡ) there is nothing hidden which will not be revealed, and there is nothing covered which will be left without uncovering it."[4]

---

[1] The reference is ambiguous, but "he" seems to refer to "the old man."

[2] Mk. 10:30; Mt. 19:30; Lk. 13:30.

[3] Mt. 11:27b; Jn. 17:26; Mt. 10:26; Lk. 12:2; 8:17; Mk. 4:22; Eph. 5:13.

[4] Cf. sayings 13, 28, 105; for the conclusion of the saying, cf. No. 4 and references.

6. (81:23-28)

Jesus said, "Blessed (ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ) is this lion which the man will eat, and the lion will become man; and polluted (hated?) is this man whom the lion will eat, and the lion will become man" (sic).[1]

7. (81:28-82:3)

And he said, "Man is like a wise fisherman: he (lit., "this one") cast his net into the sea (ΘΑΛΑΣΣΑ) (and) drew it up out of the sea (ΘΑΛΑΣΣΑ) full of little fish. Among them the wise fisherman found a large, good fish. He threw all the little fish down into the sea (ΘΑΛΑΣΣΑ): he chose the large fish without (ΧΩΡΙΣ) trouble. He who has ear to hear, let him hear!"

8. (82:3-12)

Jesus said, "Behold, the sower went out. He filled his hand (and) threw. Some (MEN) fell upon the path (and) the birds came (and) gathered them. Some others fell upon the rock (ΠΕΤΡΑ), and they sent no root down into the soil and they thrust no ear of corn up toward heaven. And some others fell upon the thorns, (and) they choked the seed and the worm ate them. And some others fell upon the good ground, and it brought forth good fruit (ΚΑΡΠΟΣ) toward heaven, (and) it came to sixty measures and a hundred-twenty measures."[1]

---

[1] The reverse of the last clause would logically be, "and the man will become lion," and thus the scribe may have erred. However, it may be that the saying was formed like this intentionally to make it more obscure. See below, chap. iv, p.190. Unfortunately the full text of this saying is lacking in Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 654, which offers no help at this point. Cf. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (eds.), New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus (London: Oxford University Press, 1904), p. 19.

9. (82:14-16)

Jesus said, "I have thrown a fire over the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ), and, behold, I am guarding it until it blazes" (burns).[2]

10. (82:16-25)

Jesus said, "This heaven will pass away (ΠΑΡΑΓΕ), and this heaven which is over it[3] will pass away (ΠΑΡΑΓΕ). And those who are dead do not live, and those who are alive will not die. In the days when you were eating that which was dead, you were making it alive. Whenever (ϨΟΤΑΝ) you are in the light, what do you do? Today you are one, you are both together.[4] But whenever (ϨΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ) you become two, what shall you do?"

---

[1] Cf. Mk. 4:3-9; Mt. 13:1-9; Lk. 8:4-8. Below, chap. iii, p. 122. Notice in 82:13 that the verb ΕΙ, "come, go," with the prep. Ν-, "to," usually is applied to persons only. Here it refers to things. See Walter Ewing Crum, A Coptic Dictionary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), p. 71a.

[2] Cf. Lk. 12:49.

[3] This translation depends on reading in 82:17 ΑΥΩ Τ̣ΕΙ Ν̄Τ̣ΠΕ Μ̄ΜΟΣ. It is possible that the blurred letters could be ΑΥΩ ΤΕΤ̣Ν̄Κ̣ΠΕ Μ̄ΜΟΣ, which would be translated, "and your heaven of heaven" (lit., "heaven of it").

[4] An alternate translation of this sentence could be "On the day (when) you are one, you have become two." Μ̄ΦΟΟΥ can mean either "today" or "on the day." Crum, op. cit., p. 731. Μ̄ΠΣΝΑΥ regularly has the adverbial force, but may possibly be translated "two." Ibid., pp. 346b, 347a.

11. (82:25-30)

The disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) said to Jesus, "We know that you will depart from us. What (then) will be greater than we?" Jesus said to them, "The place whence you came, to which you are going to James the Just (ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ), on whose account heaven and earth came into being."[1]

12. (82:30-83:14)

Jesus said to his disiples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ), "Compare me and tell me what I am like." Simon Peter said to him, "You are like a righteous (ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ) angel" (ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ). Matthew said to him, "You are like a wise philosopher-man" (ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΟΣ). Thomas said to him, "Master, my ⟨my⟩ mouth simply (ϩΟΛΩΣ) will not suffer (?) me to say what you are like." Jesus said, "I am not your (sing.) master (teacher) (any longer), because (ΕΠΕΙ) you have drunk (and) become drunk from the bubbling fountain (well?) (ΠΗΓΗ) which I came and dug" (?).[2] And he took him aside (and) withdrew (ΑΝΑΧΩΡΕΙ). He spoke three words to him. But (ΔΕ) after Thomas had returned to his comrades, they asked him, "What did Jesus say to you?" Thomas said to them, "If I should tell you one of the words that he spoke to me, you would take stones and throw (them) at me, and a fire would come out of the stones and burn you."[1]

---

[1] 82:26 NIM is an interrogative pronoun that may be translated either "who?" or "what?" If Jesus is referring to "the place," then "what?" would be correct, but if he is referring to "James the Just," then "who?" should be read. In the latter instance the translation would be: "Who (then) will be greater than we?" Jesus said to them, "The place to which you have gone you will go to James the Just...." But this translation is unlikely since Jesus' answer gives priority to ΠΜΑ, "the place," not to "James the Just;" hence, the above translation stands.

[2] Notice that the reply of Jesus is to Thomas alone of the three, since the singular possessive adjective is used: ΠΕΚΣΑϩ, "your master." The final clause "which I came and dug" is difficult to translate. The text has ΕΤΑΕΙ ΑΝΟΚ N̄ΤΑΕΙ ϣΙΤΣ . ΕΤΑΕΙ may simply = ΤΑΕΙ, "this," or it may be the relative ΕΤ- plus 1 c. s. Conjunctive ΤΑ- (the two "T's" fuse together), plus ΕΙ "come." N̄ΤΑΕΙ may = genitive N̄-

13. (83:14-19)

Jesus said to them, "If you fast (ΝΗΣΤΕΥΕ), you will produce (beget) sin against (for) yourselves; and if you pray you will be condemned (ΚΑΤΑΚΡΙΝΕ); and if you give alms (ΕΛΕΗΜΟΣΥΝΗ) you will do an evil (ΚΑΚΟΝ) to your spirits" (ΠΝΑ).

14. (83:19-27)

[Jesus said,] "And when you go (forth) into any land and walk in (its) districts (ΧΩΡΑ), if they receive (ΠΑΡΑΔΕΧΕ) you, eat whatever they may set before you. --Those who are

---

plus the demonstrative ΤΑΕΙ, "this," or the alternate form 1 c. s. Conjunctive N̄ΤΑ-, plus ΕΙ, "come." See J. Martin Plumley, An introductory Coptic Grammar (London: Home and van Thal, 1948), pars. 225, 226, for the forms and use of the Conjunctive. The form ϣΙΤΣ seems to be ϣΙΤ⸗, from ϣΙΤΕ, "demand, extort," but it may be the A form of ϣΙΚΕ, "dig," Crum, op. cit., pp. 594a, b, 555b. Thus, an alternate translation would be, "which I obtained by prayer," but the above seems most likely in view of the context. At any rate, the form ϣΙΤΣ is irregular. It is possible that an initial Ε- was omitted by scribal error, which would have indicated the aim or purpose of Jesus' coming, namely, "to dig it" (the well). See Plumley, op. cit., par. 251.

[1] Leipoldt, op. cit., col. 484, separates this saying at "And he took him aside...." There is no justification for this, neither as regards content nor form. The last verb ΡΩϩΚ seems to be from ΡΩΚϩ, "burn," Crum, op. cit., p. 293a, b. If so, we have a simple case of metathesis, which is common in Coptic.

sick among them, heal (ΘΕΡΑΠΕΥΕ) them.-- For (ΓΑΡ) what may go into your mouth will not defile you, but (ΑΛΛΑ) what comes out of your mouth is that which will defile you."[1]

15. (83:27-31)

Jesus said, "Whenever (ϩΟΤΑΝ) you see Him who was not born of woman, fall upon your face and worship Him. That one (is) your Father."

16. (83:31-84:5)

Jesus said, "Perhaps (ΤΑΧΑ) men think that I have come to cast peace (ΕΙΡΗΝΗ) over the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ), and do not know that I have come to cast divisions over the earth--a fire, a sword, a war (ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ). For (ΓΑΡ) five shall be in a (one?) house; three shall be against two and two against three, the father against the son and the son against the father, and they shall stand, they who are solitaries" (monks?) (ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ).[2]

17. (84:5-9)

Jesus said, "I shall give you what no eye has seen and what no ear has heard and what no hand has touched and what has not entered into the heart of man."[3]

---

[1] This saying lacks the introductory formula in the text, and the sentence set off by dashes breaks the connection, though it seems to belong to the context. Cf. Lk. 10:8, 9; Mk. 7:15; Mt. 15:11. See chap. iv, p.153.

[2] Cf. Mt. 10:34-36; Lk. 12:51-53.

[3] Cf. I Cor. 2:9.

18. (84:9-17)

The disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) said to Jesus, "Tell us in what manner our end will occur." Jesus said, "You indeed (ΓΑΡ) revealed the beginning (ΑΡΧΗ) in order that you might seek after the end, for in the place where the beginning (ΑΡΧΗ) was (?), there the end will be. Blessed (ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ) is he who has stood (?) in the beginning (ΑΡΧΗ), and he shall know the end and shall not taste death."[1]

19. (84:17-25)

Jesus said, "Blessed (ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ) is he who previously existed before he came into being. If you become (are?) my disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) (lit., "disciples to me"), and if you hear my words, these stones shall serve (ΔΙΑΚΟΝΕΙ) you. For (ΓΑΡ) you have five trees in Paradise (ΠΑΡΑΔΙΣΟΣ); they are not shaken summer (and) winter, and their leaves are not wont to fall. He who shall know them shall not taste death."

20. (84:26-33)

The disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) said to Jesus, "Tell us what the kingdom of heaven is like." He said to them, "It is like a grain of mustard which is smaller than (ΠΑΡΑ) all the seeds;

---

[1] The passage is very difficult. *The Princeton Translation*, p. 2, has for the first part of Jesus' answer, "Have you indeed (gar) uncovered the beginning (arche), in order that you might seek after the end?" This may be correct. Further, the verb in 84:15 as it stands is ΠΕΤΝΑϩΩϩΕ, which is relative future, but this may be a case of metathesis. Thus, ΠΕΝΤΑϩΩϩΕ , relative perfect, as given in the translation. This seems likely in view of the use of the perfect in 84:11, where mention is first made of the ΑΡΧΗ.

but whenever (ϩOTAN ΔE) it falls upon the cultivated soil, it is wont to send up a great stalk and to become a shelter (ΣΚΕΠΗ) for the birds of the sky."[1]

21. (84:33-85:6)

Mary said to Jesus, "Whom do your disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) resemble?" He said, "They are like little children visiting (dwelling at) a field which is not theirs. When (ϩOTAN) the owners of the field come, they will say, 'Leave our field to us.' They (the children) strip (themselves) naked before them in order to leave it (the field) to them and give (their) field (back) to them."[2]

22. (85:6-19)

"Because of this (ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥΤΟ) I say, If the master of the house knows that the thief is coming, he will be awake (wakeful) before he comes, and he will not let him dig into his house of his kingdom to [taḳe aẉay] his goods (ΣΚΕΥΟΣ). But (ΔΕ) you, be awake before (watch out for?) the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ). Gird yourselves over your loins with a great power (ΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ) in order that (ϣINA) the robbers (ΛΗΣΤΗΣ) may find no way to come upon you. For (ΕΠΕΙ) the weakness (?) (ΧΡΕΙΑ) which you anticipate they will find. May there be a man of understanding (ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΩΝ) in your midst! When the fruit (ΚΑΡΠΟΣ) had ripened, he came in haste with his sickle in his hand, (and) he harvested[1] it. He who has ear to hear, let him hear!"

---

[1] Cf. Mk. 4:30-32; Mt. 13:31-32; Lk. 13:18-19.

[2] Cf. Mt. 24:40-42.

23. (85:20-35)

Jesus saw some little ones nursing (lit., "receiving milk"). He said to his disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ), "These little ones nursing (receiving milk) are like those who enter the kingdom." They said to him, "Then if we become small, shall we enter the kingdom?" Jesus said to them, "Whenever (ϩOTAN) you make the two one, and whenever you make the inside like the outside and the outside like the inside, and the upper like the lower ⟨and⟩ in order to (ϣINA) make the male with the female into one only, so that the male may not be male and the female not be female, whenever (ϩOTAN) you make eyes in place of an eye and a hand in place of a hand and a foot in place of a foot (and) an image (ϩIKΩN) in place of an image (ϩIKΩN), then (TOTE) you shall enter [the kingdom]."[2]

---

[1] The verb in 85:18, ϩAΣ*, could be from ϩIΣE, "toil, be troubled," but is best understood as the form AϩΣ*, A^2 become ϩAΣ*, by metathesis from ΩϩΣ, "reap, mow," Crum, op. cit., pp. 710b, 538b. Cf. Mt. 24:42-43; Lk. 12:39-40; Mt. 6:19; Mk. 4:29.

[2] The emendation suggested in a letter from Professor Kendrick Grobel, Bangalore, South India, October 17, 1959, is a rather drastic alteration of the text. First, the AYΩ of 85:28 is taken as a scribal error; it could have been that a glance at the AYΩ in 85:27, almost directly above, resulted in the unconscious addition of the conjunction. It is possible that the scribe added it due to the pattern of the series of preceding expressions wherein "and" was used repeatedly to join the phrases. Next, the addition of [yes. But] after "the female not be female" forms a sharp contrast with the first part of the saying. This supplement is based upon two reasons: (1) It results in a clearer interpretation of the

24. (86:1-3)

Jesus said, "I shall choose you, one out of a thousand and two out of ten thousand, and they shall stand as a single one" (they shall stand being one only?).

25. (86:3-10)

His disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) said, "Show us the place (ΤΟΠΟΣ) where you are, since (ΕΠΕΙ) it is necessary (ΑΝΑΓΚΗ) for us to seek after it." He said to them, "He who has an ear, let him hear. There is light within a man of light, and it illumines the whole world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ). When it does not illumine, it (the world) is darkness."[1]

26. (86:10-12)

Jesus said, "Love your brother as yourself (soul) (ΨΥΧΗ); protect (ΤΗΡΕΙ) him like the pupil of your eye."[2]

---

meaning of the words which follow; (2) It fits well into the collection's antipathy for Jewish legalism. The last word [Amente (or Hades?)] may have stood in the original, since the lacuna at 85:35 is large enough for this as well as for [the kingdom]. However, another point of view may clear up the ambiguity. Since part of the concern of Thomas is to restore the discordant plurality of the universe and man especially to its original unity or oneness in God, the strange features of Saying 23 are the result of an attempt to express the need for this unity. Central to the thought here is the most basic division in man, that of sex. All the other expressions revolve around this aspect and are related to it. See below, chaps. iii, pp.107-10, and vi, pp.243-44.

[1] Cf. Mt. 6:22, 23; Lk. 11:34-36.

[2] In 86:11, notice the imperative EPI-, AA^{2} from EIPE, "act, become, make, do," Crum, op. cit., p. 83a, joined to the Greek verb THPEI, from τηρεῖν. Cf. Mt. 5:43; Lk. 6:27-28.

27. (86:12-17)

Jesus said, "The chip that is in the eye of your brother you see; but (ΔE) the beam that is in your eye you do not see. Whenever (ϩOTAN) you throw the beam out of your eye, then (TOTE) you will see (how) to throw the chip out of the eye of your brother."[1]

28. (86:17-20)

[Jesus said,] "If you do not fast (NHΣTEYE) to the world (KOΣMOΣ), you shall not find the kingdom; (and) if you do not make the Sabbath to be Sabbath, you shall not see the Father."[2]

29. (86:20-31)

Jesus said, "I stood in the midst of the world (KOΣMOΣ), and I appeared to them in [f̣ḷẹs]h ([Σ̣Α̣Ρ̣]Ξ). I found them all drunken; I found no one among them thirsty, and my soul (ΨYXH) gri[ẹṿ]ed over the sons of men because they are blind in their heart and they do not see that they came into the world (KOΣMOΣ) empty. They also (further?) seek to go out of the world (KOΣMOΣ) empty, only (ΠΛΗΝ) now they are drunken. Whenever (ϩOTAN) they cast off their wine (throw off the effects of their wine?), then (TOTE) they will repent" (METANOEI).[1]

---

[1] Cf. Mt. 7:3-5; Lk. 6:41-42.

[2] The introductory formula is missing here, but is present in Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:2; see *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, I, 1-3. One must also remark that the conditional particle ϢAN, is missing in the protasis of both parallel members of the saying, but a conditional clause is clearly indicated in both instances by the use of the II present in the protasis. Plumly, *op. cit.*, par. 378, points out that in negations of such prospective conditions the conditional particle is generally omitted.

30. (86:31-87:2)

Jesus said, "If the flesh (ΣΑΡΞ) came into being because of spirit (Π̅Ν̅Α̅), that would be a wonder; but (ΔΕ) if spirit (Π̅Ν̅Α̅) because of the body (ΣΩΜΑ), that would be a wonder [of wonders]. But (ΑΛΛΑ) I marvel at this, (that) [this grea]t wealth was put into this poverty."

31. (87:2-5)

Jesus said, "At the place where there are three godly ones (three gods?), these are in God (these are gods?); at the place where there are two or one, I am with him."[2]

---

[1] In 86:30, 31, there is the attachment of the construct P- from EIPE, "act, become, befall, make, do," Crum, *op. cit.*, p. 83a, to the Greek verb μετανοεῖν, "to repent." The Coptic New Testament regularly uses the Greek verb alone without EIPE. Cf. Mt. 3:2; 4:17; 11:20, 21; 12:41; Mk. 1:15; 6:12; Lk. 10:13; 11:32; 13:3, 5, etc., *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic*, ed. George W. Horner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), Vols. I and II.

[2] Grobel, *op. cit.*, comments on this saying: "Is this tritheism? The document is clearly trinitarian, but can it so naively misunderstand the Trinity, when the second part seems to be an innocent variant of Mt. 18:20?

"ΠΜΑ ΕΥN̄ ϢΟΜΤ N̄ΝΟΥΤΕ M̄ΜΑΥ ϩN̄ΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΕ.

"ϩN̄ΝΟΥΤΕ is ambiguous, since this work does not distinguish, as more careful works do, between ϩEN- (article) and ϩN̄-(preposition). Pap. Oxy.1, No. 5: [οὐκ] ε[ἰσιν] ἀθεοι (cf. Eph. 2:12), '"not without God,"' indicates that N- is the preposition: '"in God."' Thus, the first N̄ΝΟΥΤΕ must be the adjective (Crum, *op. cit.*, p. 231a, ΝΟΥΤΕ='"godly, divine."'). M̄ΠΝΟΥΤΕ '"for God"' or N̄ΡM̄ΝΟΥΤΕ '"men of God"' would have been less ambiguous." Thus he gives the translation: 'Where there are three godly ones, they are in God; where there are two or one, I, myself, am with him.' Note that now the 'two' and the 'one' are of the same sort as the

32. (87:5-7)

Jesus said, "There is no prophet (ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ) accepted in his own village; a physician is not wont to cure those who know him."[1]

33. (87:7-10)

Jesus said, "A city (ΠΟΛΙΣ) built upon a high mountain and made fast cannot fall nor (ΟΥΔΕ) will it be able to be hidden."[2]

34. (87:10-18)

Jesus said, "What you will hear with your ear, in the other ear proclaim it upon (from?) your roofs. For (ΓΑΡ) one is not wont to light a lamp and put it under a measure, nor (ΟΥΔΕ) is one wont to put it in a concealed place; but (ΑΛΛΑ) he is wont to put it upon the lampstand (ΛΥΧΝΙΑ) so that everyone who comes in and goes out may see its light."[3]

35. (87:18-20)

Jesus said, "If a blind man leads a blind man, they

'three'--all are people.

"If Greek was the original, could it have been this: ὅπου ἐὰν ὦσιν γ' θεῖοι, οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄθεοι· καὶ ὅπου δύο ἢ εἷς μόνος, ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ'αὐτῶν ?

"I know this will not fit into the Oxy. Pap.; this would have to be the text of a common ancestor." See chap. ii, p. , for the restored text of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:5.

[1] Cf. Mk. 6:4; Mt. 13:57; Jn. 4:44.

[2] Cf. Mt. 5:14b.

[3] Cf. Mt. 10:27; 5:15; Lk. 11:33; Mk. 4:21; Lk. 8:16.

are both wont to fall down into a pit."[1]

36. (87:20-24)

Jesus said, "It is impossible for one to enter into the house of the strong man and to take it in violence except (EIMHTI) he bind his hands; then (TOTE) he will plunder his house."[2]

37. (87:24-27)

Jesus said, "Take no care (thought) from morning to evening and from evening to morning what you shall put on."[3]

38. (87:27-88:2)

His disciples (MAΘHTHΣ) said, "On what day will you be revealed to us and on what day shall we see you?" Jesus said, "Whenever (ϩOTAN) you strip yourselves of your shame and take your garments and put them under your feet, like little children, and tread upon them, the[ṇ] (TOT[Ẹ]) [you shall be] sons of the Living One and you shall not be afraid."[4]

39. (88:2-7)

Jesus said, "Many times you desired (EΠIΘYMEI) to hear these words which I am saying to you, and you had not another by whom to hear them. Days are coming when you shall seek me and not find me."[1]

---

[1] Cf. Mt. 15:14; Lk. 6:39.

[2] Cf. Mk. 3:27; Mt. 12:29; Lk, 11:21-22.

[3] Cf. Mt. 6:25-34; Lk. 12:22-31.

[4] In 87:34, 88:1, the cj. [TETNAϢΩΠE N]ϢHPE "you shall be sons," could possibly be [TETNAϬΩϢT Π]ϢHPE "shall see the Son," but 88:1, the first letter in the line looks more like a blurred Ẹ than a Ṭ, though this is not absolutely certain.

40. (88:7-13)

Jesus said, "The Pharisees (ΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΟΣ) and the Scribes (ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΣ) have taken the keys of knowledge (ΓΝΩΣΙΣ) (and) hidden them; they neither (OYTE) went in nor did they permit those who wished to go in. But (ΔΕ) you, be wise (ΦΡΟΝΙΜΟΣ) as serpents and harmless (innocent) (ΑΚΕΡΑΙΟΣ) as doves."[2]

41. (88:13-16)

Jesus said, "A grapevine was planted apart from the Father, and it is not firm (strong?); it will be plucked up by its roots and will perish."[3]

42. (88:16-18)

Jesus said, "He who has in his hand, to him shall be given; and he who has not, even the little which he has shall be taken from him."[4]

---

[1] Jn. 7:34, 36; 13:33; Mt. 13:16-17; Lk. 10-23-24.

[2] Lk. 11:52; Mt. 23:13; 10:16.

[3] In 88:13 OYBE can be the preposition "opposite, toward, against," but is most likely a compound with NEΛΩOΛE, N- plus "vine." BE seems to be from BΩ, nn. f. "tree," Crum, *op. cit.*, p. 28a. The Achmimic form is BOY. Though Crum gives no examples, it is possible that BOY became BEY, then BE (or BOY to BY to BE?). In 88:14 the word MΠEIΩT, genitive N-, plus masculine article Π-, plus EIΩT, nn. m. "barley," or "father," *ibid.*, pp. 87a, 86b. The word may be intended as a pun, but doubtless "Father" is the correct translation. cf. Mt. 15:3-20, especially verse 13!

[4] Mk. 4:25; Mt. 13:12; 25:29; Lk. 8:18b; 19:26. cf. Saying 73.

43. (88:19)

Jesus said, "Become while you pass through" (Be, as passing away.) (ΠΑΡΑΓΕ).[1]

44. (88:20-26)

His disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) said to him, "Who are you who tell us these things?" [Jesus said,] "By the things which I tell you do you not know who I am? But (ΑΛΛΑ) you have been like the Jews (ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΣ); for they love the tree (and) hate its fruit (ΚΑΡΠΟΣ), and they love the fruit (ΚΑΡΠΟΣ) (and) hate the tree."

45. (88:26-31)

Jesus said, "He who has blasphemed the Father will be forgiven, and he who has blasphemed the Son will be forgiven; but (ΔΕ) he who has blasphemed the Holy Spirit ($\overline{\text{ΠΝΑ}}$) will not be forgiven, neither (ΟΥΤΕ) on earth nor (ΟΥΤΕ) in heaven."[2]

46. (88:31-89:6)

Jesus said, "One is not wont to gather grape(s) from acacia (thorn tree), nor (ΟΥΤΕ) is one wont to gather fig(s) from camel spikes; they are not wont to give fruit (ΚΑΡΠΟΣ). [Ạṇḍ ạ g̣ọ]od ([ΑΓ̣Α̣]ΘΟΣ) man is wont to bring a good thing (ΑΓΑΘΟΝ) out of his treasure; (and) an e[ṿịḷ] (ΚΑ[Κ̣Ο̣Σ̣]) man is wont to bring 105 (?) evils out of his evil treasure, which is in his heart, and he is wont to speak evil things (ΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ), for (ΓΑΡ) out of the abundance of the heart he is wont to bring forth evil things" (ΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ).[1]

---

[1] Joachim Jeremias, Unknown Sayings of Jesus, trans. Reginald H. Fuller (London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1957), p. 99, refers to the saying found on a Mosque at Fateh-pur-Sikri, south of Delhi, India: "'Jesus, on whom be peace, has said: This world is a bridge. Pass over it. But build not your dwelling there.'" Leipoldt, op. cit., col. 487, suggests that Saying 43 may be derived from it.

[2] Cf. Mk. 3:28-30; Mt. 12:31-32; Lk. 12:10. Notice that Saying 45 adds "the Father," whereas only the "Holy Spirit" is mentioned in Mark and "Son" and "Holy Spirit" in Matthew and Luke.

47. (89:6-12)

Jesus said, "From Adam to John the Baptist (ΒΑΠΤΙΣΤΗΣ) among those born of women there is none higher than John the Baptist (ΒΑΠΤΙΣΤΗΣ), lest (ϣINA) (seeing such) one's (lit., "his") eyes should burst. But (ΔΕ) I have said, he who shall be small among you shall know the kingdon, and he shall be higher than John."[2]

48. (89:12-17)

Jesus said, "It is impossible for a man to mount two horses or to draw two bows; and it is impossible for a servant to serve two masters, else (H) he will honor (TIMA) the one, and the other he will insult" (ϩYBPIZE).[1]

---

[1] In 89:2 there occurs the peculiar P̅E̅, which may be the number "105," which perhaps is indicated by the line above the letters which is regular for the writing of numerals. However, it could be from PEN, AA^{2}FO, PAN, nn. m. "name," Crum, op. cit., p. 297b; but the abbreviated form P̅E̅ with the line above is usually reserved for words occurring at the end of a line to save space. I know of no such occurrences in the Gospel of Thomas except at the end of the line. Cf. Lk. 6:43-45; Mt. 7:16-20; 12:33-35.

[2] In 89:9 ϣINA ϪE NOYⲰϬⲠ Ⲛ̄ϬI NEϤBAⲖ, literally, "that not to burst, namely his eyes." The phrase is difficult to translate, but I venture the above as indicative of the meaning. Cf. Mt. 11:11; Lk. 5:28.

49. (89:17-23)

[Jesus said,] "A man is not wont to drink old (wine) and immediately wish (ΕΠΙΘΥΜΕΙ) to drink new wine; and one is not wont to put new wine into old wineskin(s) (ΑΣΚΟΣ) lest they burst, and one is not wont to put old wine into a new wineskin (ΑΣΚΟΣ) lest (ϣINA) it (the skin) spoil it (the wine). One is not wont to sew an old rag on a new garment since (ΕΠΕΙ) a tear would occur."[2]

50. (89:24-27)

Jesus said, "If two make peace (ΕΙΡΗΝΗ) with each other in the same family, they shall say to the mountain, 'Move!' and it shall move."[3]

51. (89:27-30)

Jesus said, "Blessed (ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ) are you solitary (ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ) and elect ones; for you shall find the kingdom, because you are from it (and) you shall return (ΠΑΛΙΝ) to it."[4]

52. (89:30-90:7)

Jesus said, "If they ask you, 'Whence have you come?', say to them, 'We came out of the light, from the place out of which the light came [there] from him (?) alone. He [became . . . . revealed (?) . . . .] in their image' (ϩIKΩN). If they say to you, 'Are you he?', say, 'We are his sons, and we are the elect of the Living Father.' If they ask you, 'What is the sign of [y]our Father which (who?) is in you?', say to them, 'It (He?) is a movement and a rest'" (ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΙΣ).[1]

---

[1] Mt. 6:24; Lk. 16:13.

[2] I have separated this Saying from the previous one, since it is obviously separate in nature, even though the scribe joins it with the preceding and omits the introductory formula. cf. Mk. 2:21-22; Mt. 9:16-17; Lk. 5:36-39.

[3] Cf. Mk. 11:22-23; Mt. 21:21; 17:20; Lk. 17:6.

[4] Cf. Saying 77.

53. (90:7-12)

His disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) said to him, "On what day will the resting place (ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΙΣ) of the dead ones appear, and on what day will the new world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) come?" He said to them, "That which you await has come, but (ΑΛΛΑ) you are not aware of it."

54. (90:12-18)

His disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) said to him, "Twenty-four prophets (ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ) have spoken in Israel and they all have spoken concerning you." He said to them, "You have abandoned (forsaken?) the Living One who is before you, and you have spoken of those who are dead."

55. (90:18-23)

His disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) said to him, "Is circumcision of benefit (ΩΦΕΛΕΙ) or (Η) not?" He said to them, "If it had been of benefit (ΩΦΕΛΕΙ) their father would have begotten them from their mother (already) circumcised, but (ΑΛΛΑ) the true circumcision in Spirit (Π̄Ν̄Ā) has found complete benefit."[1]

---

[1] At the botton of 89 there seems to have been a footnote beside the reference mark X', which can be made out in part. Unfortunately the footnote has been lost in the piece that has disappeared from the bottom of the leaf. Judging from the mark ∵ above $\overline{\text{PE}}$, in 89:2, this peculiar expression was explained by the footnote.

56. (90:23-24)

Jesus said, "Blessed (ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ) are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven."[2]

57. (90:25-29)

Jesus said, "He who has not hated his father and his mother will not be able to be my disciple (lit., " a disciple to me") (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ), and he who has not hated his brothers and his sisters (and) has not taken up his cross (Σ⳨ΟΣ) like me (as I), he will not be worthy (ΑΞΙΟΣ) of me" (lit., "to me").[3]

58. (90:29-32)

Jesus said, "He who has known (recognized?) the world

---

[1] Jesus' answer here presents a problem of grammar. The protasis has the imperfect, which is regular. cf. Georg Steindorff, *Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), pp. 235, 236, on irreal conditions. But the apodosis, while it has the form NA of the future imperfect after the subject, does *not* have the form NEPE before the subject; yet, the first *part* of the answer seems to be the protasis and the second the apodosis as the above translation indicates.

[2] ΝΑΙΑΤΟΥ Ν̄Ν̄ϩΗΚΕ. ϪΕ ΤΩΟΥ ΤΕ ΤΜ̄ΝΤΕΡΟ Ν̄Μ̄ΠΗΥΕ, Lk. 6:20, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament . . .*, II, 104, "Blessed are the poor for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Notice the difference in the words for "blessed" and the change from "theirs" to "yours." Nevertheless, the citation here is essentially that of Luke and is closer to Luke 6:20 than to Mt. 5:3.

[3] Cf. Lk. 14:26-27; Mt. 10:37-38; Mk. 8:34; Mt. 16:24; Lk. 9:23.

(ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) has found a corpse (ΠΤΩΜΑ), and he who has found a corpse (ΠΤΩΜΑ), the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) is not worthy of him."[1]

59. (90:32-91:7)

Jesus said, "The kingdom of the Father is like a man who had [g̣ọọ]d seed. His enemy came in the night (and) sowed a tare (ZIẒANIỌN) [aṃọng] the good se[ẹd]. The man did not permit them to pluck the tare (ZIZANION). He said to them, '(No;) lest (ΜΗΠΩΣ) you should come that we might pluck the tare (ZIZANION) and you should pluck the wheat with it.' For (ΓΑΡ) on the day of harvest the tares (ZIZANION) will be revealed. They are plucked and burned."[2]

60. (91:7-9)

Jesus said, "Blessed (ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ) is the man who has toiled; he has found life."[3]

61. (91:9-12)

Jesus said, "Look upon the Living One while (ϩΩΣ) you live, lest (ϢΙΝΑ) you die and seek to see Him and not be able to see."[4]

62. (91:12-23)

[They saw (?)] a Samaritan (ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΗΣ) carrying a lamb (and) going into Judea (ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑ). He said to his disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ), "[Why does] that man (go) with (lit., "concerning, about") the lamb?" They said to him, "In order that he may kill it and eat it." He said to them, "While (ϩΩΣ) it lives he will not eat it, but (ΑΛΛΑ) if he kills it and it becomes a dead body (ΠΤΩΜΑ), (then he will eat it)." They said, "Otherwise he will not strike (?) it." He said to them, "You also, seek after a place (ΤΟΠΟΣ) for yourselves within a resting-place (a haven?) (ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΙΣ), lest you become a dead body (ΠΤΩΜΑ) and be eaten."[1]

---

[1] Cf. Saying 82.

[2] In the first three instances where ZIZANION occurs, it has the masculine singular article in each case, but in the last occurrence it has the plural article. cf. Mt. 13:24-30.

[3] Cf. Jas. 1:12; I Pe. 3:14; Prov. 8:34-35.

[4] Here I follow the translation of The Gospel According to Thomas, p. 33.

63. (91:23-34)

Jesus said, "Two shall be at rest upon one bed; the one (male?) shall die, the other (female?) shall live."

---

[1] The difficulties presented by this saying are numerous. In the first instance, I have decided in favor of the opinion of the editors of The Gospel According to Thomas, p. 32, who hold that ΑΥΝΑΥ was omitted at the beginning of 62 by haplography. It must also be observed that a literal rendition of Jesus' question to the disciples in 91:14, 15 ("He concerning (or around) the lamb?") makes no sense; hence, I have ventured the above. In 91:18 I follow the suggestion of Leipoldt, op. cit., col. 488 ["then he will eat it"]; but I think the meaning is simply implied and not that the scribe unintentionally omitted the words enclosed in parentheses. For the word ϥΝΑϣΑΣ, 3 m. s. I future ϣΑΣ, I am inclined to believe that it is ϣΑΣ⸗ from ΣΩϣ "strike," with the 3 f. s. suffix assimilated to the final Σ, Crum, op. cit., p. 374 b. It seems to me that this is much more likely than any other alternative. Crum does not give a pronominal form for ΣΩϣ that is equivalent to our word here, but it must be remembered that in this instance he does not cite evidence for all the dialects. Due to the interchangeability of ϣ and Σ, this form (ϣΑΣ) may easily be A or A^2. AA^2 peculiarities are found in several instances in the Gospel of Thomas.

Salome said, "Who are you, O man? As if out of (belonging to) one (bed?) you have ascended upon my bed and eaten from my table!" (ΤΡΑΠΕΖΑ). Jesus said to her, "I am he who is out of Him who (that which?) is scattered abroad. They have given me (I have been given) of the things which belong to my Father." [Salome said,] "I am your (feminine!) disciple" (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ). [Jesus said,] "Because of this (Therefore) I say, whenever (ϩOTAN) one is desolate, he shall die in light, but whenever (ϩOTAN ΔE) one is divided, he shall die in darkness."[1]

---

[1] In 91:24 notice ΠΟΥΑ "the masculine one" and ΤΟΥΑ "the feminine one;" the T near the end of the line is blurred, but looks more like a T than a Π. Professor Grobel, op. cit., remarks, "'The form should be TOYEIA, but just as the available plural forms are sometimes not used, so with the special feminine forms. If the two are male and female, 63 certainly seems to be continued by the statement of Salome.'" Following his suggestions yet further, the ambiguous ϩΩΣ may be the Greek ὡς and OYA may be "one" (referring to the one bed of 91:24) as well as "slander" or "blasphemy." See Crum, op. cit., pp. 468b, 469a. Grobel suggests another translation equally valid with the one I have adopted above: "Who are you, O man? As if out of (motivated by) slander you have ascended upon my bed and eaten from my table!" and adds, "'Strangely, the result is nearly the same in both cases. Shared 'bed and board' are universal symbols of marriage.'" In 91:32 ϣΗϥ, the qualitative from ϣΩϥ, "be desert, laid waste, destroyed," may mean "celibate" as Gal. 4:27 uses ἔρημος; this is possible since one of the Greek equivalents of ϣΩϥ is ἐρημοῦν. Crum, op. cit., p. 609b. In 91:34 see ΠΗϣ, the qualitative from ΠΩϣ "divide," ibid., p. 277a, b. The Greek equivalent is μερίζειν, which is used in I Cor. 7:34 to refer to one μεμέρισται by marriage. It is possible that such an allusion to marriage is being made here. Finally, the phrases "die in light," "die in darkness," by the division of the words as follows: ϥNAMOY[ϩ N]OYOEIN ...ϥNAMOY ϩN̄KAKE , could be translated "he will be filled with light...he will be filled with darkness." However, if the setting is such as suggested by the beginning of the saying, then the former translation should be adopted (which depends on the following division of the words: ϥNAMOY [ϩN] OYOEIN, ϥNAMOY ϩN̄KAKE). cf. Mt. 24:40-41; Lk. 17:34 for parallels to the opening statement.

64. (91:34-92:2)

[Je]sus said, "I tell my mysteries (ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ) to those [who are sons of (?) my m]ysteries ([Μ]ΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ). Behold, what your right hand will do, do not let your left hand know what it does."[1]

65. (92:2-10)

Jesus said, "There was a rich (ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ) man who had much property (ΧΡΗΜΑ). He said, 'I will make use (ΧΡΩ) of my property (ΧΡΗΜΑ) in order that I may sow and reap in my plantation (?) and fill my barns with produce (ΚΑΡΠΟΣ), in order that (ϣINA) I may not be in want at all.' These were the things he was thinking in his heart, and in that night he died. He who has ear, let him hear!"[2]

66. (92:10-35)

Jesus said, "A man was having some guests, and when he had prepared the supper (ΔΙΠΝΟΝ), he sent his servant to (ϣINA) summon the guests. He went to the first one; he said to him, 'My master summons you.' He replied, 'I have some money for some merchants (ΕΜΠΟΡΟΣ). They are coming to me at evening. I shall go and give them an order. I beg off (ΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ) from the supper' (ΔΙΠΝΟΝ). He went to another; he said to him, 'My master has summoned you.' He replied to him, 'I have bought a house and they are asking (ΑΙΤΕΙ) me for a day (ϩΗΜΕΡΑ). I shall have no leisure.' He went to another; he said to him, 'My master summons you.' He replied to him, 'My friend is to marry, and (it is) I (who) shall prepare (give?) the wedding supper (ΔΙΠΝΟΝ). I shall not be able to come. I beg off (ΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ) from the supper' (ΔΙΠΝΟΝ). He went to another one; he said to him, 'My master summons you.' He replied to him, 'I have bought a village (ΚΩΜΗ); I am going to collect the taxes. I shall not be able to come. I beg off' (ΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ). The servant came; he told his master, 'Those whom you have summoned to the supper (ΔΙΠΝΟΝ) have begged off' (ΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ). The master said to his servant, 'Go out to the roads, (and) those [whọṃ yọu wịll f̣ịṇ]d, bring them that they ma[ỵ ḍị]ne' ([Δ̣Ι̣Π̣]ΝΕΙ). The buyers and the mer[chạnṭs sḥạḷḷ] not [eṇṭẹr] into the places (ΤΟΠΟΣ) of my Father."[1]

---

[1] As a basis for the emendation at 91:35-92:1 compare Clem. Alex. Stromateis V. 10: οὐ γαρ φθονῶν, φησὶ παρέγγειλεν ὁ κύριος ἔν τινι Εὐαγγελίῳ· Μυατήριον [Μυσ-] ἐμον ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου.: Pat. Gr., IX, col. 97. cf. also Mt. 6:3-4.

[2] In 92:5, 6, the forms ϩN- TATΩϬE, preposition ϩN- "in" plus TA- feminine possessive adjective, 1 c.,s., plus TΩϬE, which would have to be a new feminine noun from TΩΩϬE, "plant," Crum, op. cit., p. 465a. This provides a better sense than that of some other translators who have ignored the ϩ at the end of line 5 and have taken the form NTA-, line 6, as the 1 c. s. conjunctive. cf. Lk. 12:13-21.

67. (93:1-16)

He said, "A ki[ṇḍ] (ΧΡΗ[Σ̣Τ̣Ο̣Σ̣]) man h[ạḍ] a vineyard. He gave it to the vinedressers that (ϣΙΝΑ) they might work it and that he thus should receive of its fruit (ΚΑΡΠΟΣ) through them. He sent his servant so that the vinedressers should give to him of the fruit (ΚΑΡΠΟΣ) of the vineyard; (but) they seized his servant (and) beat him and almost killed him (lit., "a little more, and they had killed him"). The servant went; he told it to his master. His master said, 'Perhaps he did not know them.' He sent another servant. The vinedressers beat this one, too. Then (ΤΟΤΕ) the owner sent them his son. He said, 'Perhaps they will respect (lit., "be ashamed before") my son.' (But) those vinedressers, since (ΕΠΕΙ) they knew that he was the heir (ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΟΣ) of the vineyard, seized him (and) killed him. He who has ear, let him hear!"[1]

---

[1] Cf. Lk. 14:15-24; Mt. 22:1-10.

68. (93:16-19)

Jesus said, "Show me this stone which the builders rejected; it is the cornerstone."[2]

69. (93:19-20)

Jesus said, "He who knows the Totality (the All, all things?), he alone lacks being in want everywhere."[3]

70. (93:21-24)

Jesus said, "You are blessed (ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ) whenever

---

[1] Cf. Mk. 12:1-12; Mt. 21:33-46; Lk. 20:9-19.

[2] CF. Mk. 12:10, 11; Mt. 21:42; Lk, 20:17; Ps. 118:22-23.

[3] This difficult saying may be translated several ways. Professor Grobel, op. cit., gives the following: "'When He who knows all things has one lack, He has caused every place to lack.'"

(ϩOTAN) they hate you and persecute (ΔΙΩΚΕ) you, and they shall not find place (ΤΟΠΟΣ) in the place in which they persecuted (ΔΙΩΚΕ) you."[1]

71. (93:24-27)

Jesus said, "Blessed (ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ) are these who have been persecuted (ΔΙΩΚΕ) in their heart; these are the ones who have known the Father in truth."

72. (93:27-29)

[Jesus said,] "Blessed (ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ) are they that hunger, for (ϣINA) the stomach of the one (him) who desires shall be filled."[2]

73. (93:29-33)

Jesus said, "If (ϩOTAN) you bring forth (acquire?) that One (Him?) in yourselves, (then) this One (He?) whom you have shall save you. If you do not have that One (Him?) within [ỵọ]u, this One (He?) whom you do not have within you [ṣḥạll ḳịḷ]l (?) you."[3]

---

[1] Mt. 5:11; Lk. 6:22.

[2] Cf. Lk. 6:21a; Mt. 5:6. The latter half of this saying presents a problem of translation, but it seems best to follow the above, which is in keeping with the meaning of the Lukan passage to which it is nearest. The major difficulty rests with the translation of ϣINA. Is it causal, final, or merely inferential? I take it in the latter sense, which is permissible grammatically.

[3] In 93:33 the lacuna is emended [ϥNA ΜΟΥ]Τ. This is done because the 3 m. s. I future is implied by the parallel structure of the saying, and the letters for "kill" can almost be read, though not with absolute certainty. cf. Mk. 4:25; Mt. 13:12; Lk. 8:18b; Mt. 25-29; Lk. 19:26.

74. (93:34-94:6)

Jesus said, "I shall dest[roy this temp]le and no one will be able to build it [ ] [A man said to] him, "But (ΔE) speak to my brothers that (ϣINA) they [may di]vide the property of my father with me." He said to him, "O man, who [made] me a divider?" He turned himself to his disciples (MAΘHTHΣ) (and) said to them, "(MH) I am not becoming a divider, am I?"[1]

75. (94:6-9)

Jesus said, "The harvest (MEN) is great, but (ΔE) the laborers (EPΓATHΣ) are few; but (ΔE) pray to the Lord that (ϣINA) he may send forth laborer(s) (EPΓATHΣ, singular article) to the harvest."[2]

76. (94:9-11)

He said, "O Lord, there are many around the well (?), but (ΔE) there is nothing in the well (?)."[3]

---

[1] In 93:34 about 8 spaces are missing in the hole, which would be supplied by ϣOP [ϣP ΠΕΙΕΡΠ]HEI, "dest[roy this temp]le." cf. Mk. 13:2; Mt. 24:2; Lk. 21:6; Mk. 14:58; Mt. 26:61; Jn. 2:19-22; Acts 6:14, for Jesus' canonical statements on the destruction of the temple. In 94:1 there are about 12 or 13 letters missing. The emendation of The Princeton Translation, p. 7, would fill the gap and give an acceptable meaning:" [A man said to] him...." Notice that the MH introducing the final statement of Jesus within this saying implies a negative answer as in Greek. cf. Lk. 12:13-14.

[2] Cf. Mt. 9:37-38; Lk. 10:2; Jn. 4:35.

[3] This is one of the most difficult of all the sayings in the collection. In 94:10 the word ΔΩTE, nn. m. "penetration, separation," from ΔΩTE, "to pierce, penetrate," Crum, *op. cit.*, p. 791b ff., may be rendered "entrance" as a de-

77. (94:11-13)

Jesus said, "There are many standing at the door, but (ΑΛΛΑ) it is the solitary ones (monks?) (ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ) who shall enter the bridal chamber."[1]

---

rived meaning. However, it bears the feminine article. This suggests the possibility that it is the word ϣΩΤΕ, nn. f. "well, cistern, pit," *ibid.*, p. 595a, with the initial consonant changed to Ϫ. These letters are interchangeable. Thus, ϪΩΤΕ would be translated "well." In 94:11 the word ϣΩΝΕ may be a hitherto unknown feminine noun from ϣΩΩΝΕ, "to exclude, deprive," *ibid.*, p. 571a, b. Ordinarily it would be taken as a masculine noun meaning "sickness, disease," *ibid.*, p. 571a, but here it has the feminine article. This suggests another possibility, that it may be due to a scribal error that ϣΩΝΕ was written for ϣΩΤΕ. The problems are almost insoluble. Leipoldt, *op. cit.*, col. 492, gives the translation "entrance ...excluded." *The Princeton Translation*, p. 7, has: "'Lord, there are many around the well (?), but there is nothing in the well (?),'" which may be correct. Yet again, it is possible that ϪΩΤΕ could be related to ϭΩΤϩ, nn. m. "pierced place, hole," the verb root meaning "to wound, to pierce." Thus another alternative: "There are many with (?) the wound, but there is no one with the sickness," but this does not make good sense. While I am not certain of the correct translation, one likely possibility suggests itself. It is quite possible that this saying was originally composed in Coptic with an intentional play on the words (else perhaps the text is corrupt). Puns do not easily come forth when the scribe is translating from a Greek text. It should be noted that wherever there is manifestly a Greek text behind the Coptic version, translation into English is much easier since the words utilized are not ordinarily ambiguous. One conclusion, therefore, may be that not all of the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* was originally written in Greek! The preferred translation is based on Origen *Contra Celsum* VIII. 15; 16: "How is it that many are round the well and no one goes into it?" Origen's polemic against Celsus at this point is set in the context of an assertion by Celsus that the Christians claim the supremacy of Jesus, the Son of Man, over the highest God. This needs to be studied in the light of *Thomas's* conception of Jesus and the relation of Jesus to the Father. See chap. vi, p.256.

[1] In 94:12 ϩΙΡΜ̄ΠΡΟ may be the compound preposition ϩΙΡΝ- "at, upon," Plumley, *op. cit.*, par. 277, plus masculine article plus ΡΟ "door, gate," Crum, *op. cit.*, p. 289a, or

78. (94:13-22)

Jesus said, "The kingdom of the Father is like a merchant who had a cargo (ΦΟΡΤΙΟΝ). When that merchant, who was wise, found a pearl (ΜΑΡΓΑΡΙΤΗΣ), he sold the cargo (ΦΟΡΤΙΟΝ) (and) bought for himself the single pearl (ΜΑΡΓΑΡΙΤΗΣ). You also, seek after his (His?) treasure, which is not wont to perish since it abides where no moth is wont to come nigh to eat, nor (ΟΥΔΕ) worm is wont to destroy."[1]

79. (94:22-28)

Jesus said, "I am the light which is above them all (all lights?). I am the Totality out of whom the Totality came forth and to whom the Totality has reached (?). Split the wood, and I am there; lift the stone, and you will find me there."[2]

80. (94:28-95:3)

Jesus said, "Why did you go out to the country? to see a reed being shaken [Ε̣Β̣Ο̣Λ̣(?)] by the wind and to see a m[ạṇ c̣ḷạḍ] in soft garments? [Bẹhọlḍ, tḥeṛe aṛe ỵọụṛ] kings and your great (ΜΕΓΙΣΤΑΝΟΣ) men. These bo[ṭḥ ẉeạr] soft

---

possibly the preposition ϩI- "with, in presence of," etc., ibid., p. 644b f., plus PM- from PΩME "man," plus masculine article plus PO "door," meaning "with the doorkeeper." Crum gives no citation of the second case, though it remains a possibility. cf. Mt. 7:13-14; Lk. 13:23-24.

[1] Cf. Mt. 13:45; 6:20; Lk. 12:33.

[2] Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1 places the second part of this saying in conjunction with Saying 31 and also reverses the parallel members. See Chapter II, p. 77, for a full discussion.

[gạrṃeṇtṣ], and they [ẉiḷl] not [be ạble] to discern the truth."[1]

81. (95:3-12)

A woman from the crowd said to him, "Blesse[ḍ is thẹ] womb which bore you and the [bṛẹạs]ts which nourished you!" He said to her, "Blessed are those who have heard the word (ΛΟΓΟΣ) of the Father an[ḍ ḳ]eep it in truth! For (ΓΑΡ) the days will come when you will say, 'Blessed is the womb which has not conceived and the breasts which have given no milk!'"[2]

82. (95:12-15)

Jesus said, "He who has known the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) has found the body (ΣΩΜΑ), but (ΔΕ) he who has found the body (ΣΩΜΑ), the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) is not worthy of him."[3]

83. (95:15-17)

Jesus said, "He who has become wealthy is not wont to become king, and he who has power (ΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ) is not wont to renounce (ΑΡΝΑ) (it)."[1]

---

[1] Cf. Mt. 11:7-8; Lk. 7:24b-25. The emendations upon which the translation rests are taken in part from the canonical utterance:

94:31 ΕΥΡ[Ω̣Μ̣Ε̣ Ε̣Υ̣Ϭ̣Λ̣]Ν̄ϢΤΗΝ "a m[an clad] in soft garments...;"

94:32 [Ε̣Ι̣Σ̣ Ο̣Υ̣Ν̣ Ν̣Ε̣Τ̣Ν̣]ΡΡΩΟΥ,"[Beḥọḷd, ṭḥẹre are ỵọụṛ] kings...;"

95:1, 2 ΣΝ[Α̣Υ̣ Ϭ̣Α̣Ν̣̄Ϣ̣Τ̣Η̣Ν̣ Ε̣Υ̣]ϬΗΝ,"bo[ṭḥ wẹạr] soft [garments]...;"

95:2, 3 ΣΕ[Ν̣Α̣ Ϣ̣]ΣΟΥΝ ΤΜΕ ΑΝ,"they [ẉiḷl] not [be ạble] to discern the truth."

[2] Cf. Lk. 11:27-28; 23:29.

[3] Cf. Saying 58.

84. (95:17-19)

Jesus said, "He who is near to me is near the fire, and he who is far from me is far from the kingdom."[2]

85. (95:19-24)

Jesus said, "The images (ϩΙΚΩΝ) appear to the man (show forth the man?), and the light which is in them is hidden in the image (ϩΙΚΩΝ) of the light of the Father. He will reveal (it), and his image (ϩΙΚΩΝ) is hidden by his light."[3]

86. (95:24-29)

Jesus said, "The days in which you see your likeness, you are wont to rejoice. But whenever (ϩΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ) you see your images (forms?) (ϩΙΚΩΝ) which were before you--they (the images) (forms?) are neither wont to die nor are they wont to appear--how much shall you bear?"[1]

---

[1] In 95:15, 16, 17 the form ΜΑΡΕϥ- is AA^2 3 m. s. negation I habitude instead of optative. The negative of habitude is almost always ΜΑΡΕ-, not ΜΕΡΕ- in the *Gospel of Thomas*; this is one of the AA^2 traits evident throughout. See Steindorff, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

[2] Quoted by Origen *Jer. hom.* 20:3; *Pat. Gr.* XIII, cols. 531-532.

[3] In 95:20, 21 see ΣΕΟΥΟΝϩ ΕΒΟΛ M̄ΠΡΩΜΕ. ΣΕΟΥΟΝϩ is 3 pl. I present, ΟΥΟΝϩ qualitative from ΟΥΩΝϩ, "reveal, be revealed." With ΕΒΟΛ, "show forth, appear," Crum, *op. cit.*, p. 486b. M̄ΠΡΩΜΕ, preposition Ν-, "to," or sign of the direct object, plus the masculine article, plus ΡΩΜΕ, "man." This makes possible the alternate translation given in parenthesis, "show forth the man." If this saying is a translation from a Greek original, then the first choice is more likely since ΟΥΩΝϩ ΕΒΟΛ Ν- regularly translates the Greek dative with the verb being intransitive. *Ibid.*, p. 487a.

87. (95:29-34)

Jesus said, "Adam came to be out of a great power (ΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ) and a great wealth; and he was not [ẉọṛṭ]hy of you, for (ΓΑΡ) if he had been worthy (ΑΞΙΟΣ), [ḥẹ wọụḷd] not [haṿe tạṣṭẹd] death."[2]

88. (95:34-96:4)

Jesus said, "[The foxes] [ḥạṿẹ] t[ḥẹịṛ ḥọḷẹṣ ạ]nd the birds have t[ḥeị]r nest(s), but (ΔΕ) the Son of Man has no place to lay (lit., "bend, turn, incline") his head and rest [himself]."[3]

89. (96:4-7)

Jesus said, "Wretched (ΤΑΛΑΙΠΩΡΟΝ) is the body (ΣΩΜΑ) which depends on a body (ΣΩΜΑ); and [w[ṛẹṭ]ched ([Ṭ̣ȦΛ]ΑΙΠΩΡΟΝ) is the soul (ΨΥΧΗ) which depends on both of them."[4]

90. (96:7-12)

Jesus said, "The messengers (ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ) and the prophets

---

[1] In 95:27 notice ΝΤΑϩϢΩΠΕ, A^2(?) relative perfect. Here the verbal auxiliary ΝΤΑϩ- may be either 3 m. s. or 3 c. pl. In most instances in the Gospel of Thomas it is 3 m. s., but here and in 93:27 it is 3 c. pl. The Evangelium Veritatis is basically A^2, and the same form is used interchangeably in it for both numbers as here.

[2] These emendations depend on the Princeton Translation, p. 8, which rests upon the following readings:
95:32 [Ẹ̣Ṃ̣Π̣Ϣ̣]Α, "[ẉọṛṭ]hy;"

95:33, 34 [Ṇ̣Ẹ̣Ϥ̣Ṇ̣Ạ̣Ϫ̣Ị̣ϯ̣Π̣Ẹ̣]ΑΝ, "[ḥe ẉọụḷd] not [hạve tạṣṭẹd]..."

[3] Cf. Mt. 8:20; Lk. 9:58.

[4] Cf. Saying 113.

(ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ) will come to you, and they will give you what is yours; and you also give to them what is in your hand and say to yourselves, 'On what day are they to come and receive what is theirs?'"[1]

91. (96:13-16)

Jesus said, "Why do you wash the outside of the cup (ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ)? Do you not understand (ΝΟΕΙ) that he who made the inside also made the outside?"[2]

92. (96:16-20)

Jesus said, "Come to me, for my yoke is mild (ΧΡΗΣΤΟΣ) and my lordship is gentle, and you shall find a rest (ΑΝΑΥΠΑΣΙΣ) for yourselves."[3]

93. (96:20-25)

They said to him, "Tell us who you are that (ϢΙΝΑ) we may believe (ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕ) on you." He said to them, "You test (scan?) (ΠΙΡΑΖΕ) the face of heaven and earth, and him who is in your presence you have not recognized, and you do not know (how) to test (interpret?) (ΠΙΡΑΖΕ) this season (time, moment)"

---

[1] In 96:11 see Aϣ, interrogative "who? what?" or indefinite pronoun "a certain, whatever," Crum, *op. cit*., p. 22a. It seems best due to the context to render as a question, but if Aϣ is taken in the second sense, the translation would be: "On whatever day they come they receive what is theirs." cf. Mk. 8:38b; Mt. 16:27; Lk. 9:26b.

[2] Cf. Lk. 11:39-40; Mt. 23:25-26.

[3] In 96:19 notice the faulty spelling of ἀνάπαυσις. cf. Mt. 11:28-30.

(ΚΑΙΡΟΣ).[1]

94. (96:25-33)

Jesus said, "Seek and you shall find, but (ΑΛΛΑ) the things for which you asked me in those days, I did not tell (send?) them to you then (lit., "on that day"). Now I am willing to tell (send?) them and you are not seeking after them. Do not give what is holy to the dogs lest it be cast into the dung-heap (ΚΟΠΡΙΑ). Do not cast pear[ḷṣ] (ΜΑΡΓΑΡΙΤ[Η̣Σ̣]) [before] sows, lest (ϣINA) they make [ṭḥẹ ḥ]ol]ỵ p̣ṛọfane (?)]."[2]

95. (96:33-34)

Jesus [ṣạịḍ,] "He who seeks shall find, [ạṇḍ ḥe wḥọ kṇọc̣ḳṣ], it will be opened to him."[3]

---

[1] In 96:23 the editors of *The Gospel according to Thomas*, p. 48, read K in ΠΚΑϩ, which is likely. cf. Jn. 6:30; Lk. 12:54-56; Mt. 16:2-3. In 96:23 ΠΕΤΝ̄ΠΕΤΝ̄ΜΤΟ at first glance may seem to be a case of dittography, but is not: Π- masculine article plus relative ΕΤ- plus preposition Ν̄-, "in," plus possessive adjective.

[2] In 96:27/28, 29 the form ϪOOY may be ϪO, ϪΩ , "say, speak, tell," Crum, *op. cit.*, p. 754a, or ϪOOY, "send," *ibid.*, p. 793a. The former is more probable in that the verb has an object, whereas in the latter case the object is implied. In 96:33 [Π̣Ο̣Υ̣]Α̣Α̣[Β̣ Σ̣Ο̣ϥ̣], "[ṭhe h]ol[y profane" (lit., "defiled, polluted," *ibid.*, p. 378b. cf. Mt. 7:7-8; Lk. 11:9-10; Mt. 7:6.

[3] In 96:34 the translation ["ạṇḍ ḥe wḥọ kṇọc̣ḳṣ"] depends on [Α̣Υ̣Ω̣ Π̣Ε̣Τ̣Τ̣Ω̣ϩ̣Μ̣ Ε̣]ϩOYN , as suggested by the editors of *The Gospel according to Thomas*, p. 48. Leipoldt, *op. cit.*, col. 491, suggests [Α̣Υ̣Ω̣ Π̣Ε̣Τ̣ϩ̣Ν̣Ε̣ Ε̣Ε̣Ι̣ Ε̣]ϩOYN, ["ạṇḍ ḥe wḥo desires to go i]n." Either reading is possible, but since there is no trace of the second emendation in the text, it is best to follow that suggested by the canonical text. cf. Mt. 7:7-8; Lk. 11:9-10.

96:35-97:2)

[Jesus said,] "If you have money, do not lend it for interest, but (ΑΛΛΑ) give [them] to the one from w[hom] you will not receive them (back)."[1]

97. (97:2-6)

Jesus [said,] "The [king]dom of the Father is lik[e a] woman who took a little leave[n. She hi]d it in dough, (and) she made some la[rge] loaves. He who has ear, le[t him] hear!"[2]

98. (97:7-15)

Jesus said, "The kingdom of the [Father is] like a woman carrying a j[ar] full of flour. As she walked [along a] distant road, the handle of the ja[r] broke (and) the flour poured behind [her onto] the road. (But) she did not know it; she had been unaware of trouble. After she had gone into her house, she put the jar down (and) found it empty!"

99. (97:15-20)

Jesus said, "The kingdom of the Father is like a man who wished to kill an important man (ΜΕΓΙΣΤΑΝΟΣ). He drew forth the sword in his house (and) caused it to pierce the wall, that he might know whether his hand would be strong enough. Then (TOTE) he slew the important man" (ΜΕΓΙΣΤΑΝΟΣ).

---

[1] In 97:1/2 see †.?.. ΜΠΕ[ΤΕ]ΤΝΑϪΙΤΟΥ ΑΝ Ν̄ΤΟΟΤϤ, "give [them] to the one from w[hom] you will not receive them (back)," The Gospel according to Thomas, p. 48. cf. Lk. 6:30, 34-35; Mt. 5:42.

[2] Cf. Mt. 13:33; Lk. 13:20-21; Mt. 11:15, 13:9, 43; Mk. 4:9, 23; 7:16; Lk. 8:8; 14:35; Rev. 2:7, 13:9.

100. (97:21-26)

The disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) said to him, "Your brothers and your mother are standing outside." He said to them, "Those who are in this place (lit., "these places") who do the will of my Father, these are my brothers and my mother. They are the ones who shall enter the kingdom of my Father."[1]

101. (97:27-31)

They showed Jesus a gold piece and said to him, "Those who belong to Caesar (ΚΑΙΣΑΡ) are demanding taxes from us." He said to them, "Give what belongs to Caesar (ΚΑΙΣΑΡ) to Caesar (ΚΑΙΣΑΡ); give what belongs to God to God; and what is mine give it to me!"[2]

102. (97:32-98:1)

[Jesus said,] "He who does [ṇ]ot hate his fa[tḥẹr] and his mother as I do (lit., "in my way") will not be able to be my d[ịṣc̣ịp̣l]e (Μ[Α̣Θ̣Η̣Τ̣Η̣]Σ) (lit., "a disciple to me"); and he who does [ṇọt] love hi[ṣ f̣ạṭhẹr aṇḍ] his mother as I do (lit., "in my way") will not be able to be my d[ịṣc̣ịp̣ḷe] (Μ[Α̣Θ̣Η̣Τ̣Η̣Σ̣]). For (ΓΑΡ) my mother has [..........] [ọụ]t of (?) [......], but (ΔΕ) in truth she gave life to me."[3]

---

[1] Cf. Mk. 3:31-35; Mt. 12:46-50; Lk. 8:19-21.

[2] Cf. Mk. 3:31-35; Mt. 12:46-50; Lk. 8:19-21.

[3] Cf. Mt. 10:37; Lk, 14:26; Mk. 10:29; Mt. 19:29; Lk. 18:29b; Saying 57. It is difficult to conjecture what filled the lacunae of 97:36, 98:1.

103. (98:2-5)

Jesus said, "[Ẉ]oe to them, the Pharisees (ΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΟΣ), for they are lik[ẹ] a dog lying in the manger of [tḥe] cattle (oxen); for he neither (ΟΥΤΕ) eats nor (ΟΥΤΕ) does he [peṛṃit] the cattle (oxen) to eat."

104. (98:5-10)

Jesus said, "B[ḷẹṣ]sed (Μ[ẠḲẠ]ΡΙΟΣ) is the man who knows i[ṇ wḥaṭ] part (ΜΕΡΟΣ) (when) robbers (ΛΗΣΤΗΣ) are coming in, tha[ṭ] (ϣΙΝ[Ạ]) [ḥe ṃaỵ] arise and collect (?) his [...], and that he may gird himself over his loins [ḅẹ]fore they come in."[1]

105. (98:10-16)

They said [tọ Ḥịm,] "Come and let us pray today and fast" (ΝΗΣΤΕΥΕ). Jesus said, [No;] for (ΓΑΡ) what is the sin which I have committed, or (Η) in what was I defeated? But whenever (ΑΛΛΑ ϩΟΤΑΝ) the bridegroom (ΝΥΜΦΙΟΣ) goes out of the bridal chamber (ΝΥΜΦΩΝ), then (ΤΟΤΕ) let there be fasting (ΝΗΣΤΕΥΕ) and praying."[2]

---

[1] 98:7 probably should read ϩ[Ν Αϣ] ̄ΜΜΕΡΟΣ, "in what part," as the editors of The Gospel according to Thomas, p. 52, indicate. In 98:8, 9 see ΝϥΣΩϩΟΥϩ ΝΤΕϥΜΝΤ [...]. The first form seems to be 3 m. s. Conjunctive of ΣΩΟΥϩ, with a ϩ crossed out by a horizontal stroke after the Ω, ibid. What fills the lacuna after the noun prefix ΜΝΤ- (forming feminine abstracts) is more difficult to ascertain. Could it be ΜΝΤ[ϬΡΟ], "strength," Crum, op. cit., p. 785a? cf. Mt. 24:43; Lk. 12:39, 35.

[2] Cf. Mk. 2:18-20; Mt. 9:14-15; Lk. 5:33-35.

106. (98:16-18)

Jesus said, "He who shall know the father and the mother shall be called the son of a harlot" (ΠΟΡΝΗ).[1]

107. (98:18-22)

Jesus said, "Whenever (ϩOTAN) you make the two one, you shall be the sons of man; and whenever you say, 'Mountain, move!' it will move."

108. (98:22-27)

Jesus said, "The kingdom is like a shepherd who had a hundred sheep. One of them, the largest, went astray. He left the ninety-nine (and) sought after this one until he found it. After he had toiled, he said to the sheep, 'I love you more than (ΠΑΡΑ) the ninety-nine.'"[2]

109. (98:28-30)

Jesus said, "He who has drunk from my mouth shall be like me. I also shall become one with him (lit., "shall become he"), and the things which are hidden shall be revealed to him."[3]

110. (98:31-99:3)

Jesus said, "The kingdom is like a man who had a h[idden] treasure in his field, [he] being ignorant of it. And [he did not find it before] he died. He bequeathed (lit., "left") it to his [son. His] son [did] not know it. He took that field (and) sold [it. And he who] bought it came, (and) while plo[w]ing [he found] the t[reasure]. He began (ΑΡΧΕΙ) to lend money for interest [to those whom] he w[ish]ed."[1]

---

[1] Professor Grobel, *op. cit.*, translates and comments: "'He who shall know father and mother will (nevertheless) be called the harlot's son.' The first 'shall' seems to be a logical future: at the time when he is so called. Does this refer to the Jewish calumny on Jesus' birth?"

[2] Cf. Lk. 15:3-6; Mt. 18:12-14.

[3] Cf. Jn. 7:37?

111. (99:4-5)

Jesus said, "He who has found the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) and has become rich, let him deny (ΑΡΝΑ) [the w]orld" ([Κ]ΟΣΜΟΣ).

112. (99:6-10)

Jesus said, "The heavens [an]d the earth shall be unrolle[d] before you, and he [who is alive] from out of the Living One shall not see death nor (fear), ((because (ϨΟΤΙ) Jesus says, "He who has found Him alone, the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) is not worthy of him.")).[2]

113. (99:10-12)

Jesus said, "[W]oe to the flesh (ΣΑΡΞ) whic[h d]epends on the soul (ΨΥΧΗ); (and) woe to the soul (ΨΥΧΗ) which depends on the flesh" (ΣΑΡΞ).[1]

---

[1] Cf. Mt. 13:44. In 99:3 the last construction in the line is difficult to make out but seems to be [ΝΝΕΤ]ϥ̄ ΟΥϢΟΥ, "[to those whom] he w[ish]ed."

[2] In 99:8 ΟΥ[Χ] ϨΟΤΙ may be the correct reading; however, the editors of *The Gospel according to Thomas*, p. 54, read ΟΥΔ ϨΟΤΙ and hold that this is a case of haplography for ΟΥΔΕ ΕϨΟΤΕ ϨΟΤΙ. Their emendation is certainly possible and would simplify the problem of translation; consequently, following their suggestion the above translation is given. For the translation of οὐχ ὅτι, see Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), p. 539a. cf. Isa. 34:4; Heb. 1:12; Rev. 6:14.

114. (99:12-18)

His disciples (ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ) said to him, "On what day is the king[ḍọ]m to come?" [Jesus said,] "It does not come [ạṣ ọṇe] expects. They will not say, 'Behold, here,' or (Η) 'Behold, there,' but (ΑΛΛΑ) the kingdom of the Father is spread abroad over the eart[ḥ, ạ]nd men do not see it."[2]

115. (99:18-26)

Simon Peter said to them, "Let Mary go away from among us because females are not worthy of Life." Jesus said, "Lo, I myself shall induce her so that I may make her male, in order that (ϣΙΝΑ) she, too, m[ạ]y become a living spirit (Π̄Ν̄Α̅), which, like you, is masculine; for every female who shall make herself male shall enter into the kingdom of heaven."[3]

THE GOSPEL (ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ)

ACCORDING TO (ΚΑΤΑ) THOMAS

---

[1] Cf. Saying 89.

[2] Cf. Lk. 17:20-21; Mt. 24:23; Jn. 1:26.

[3] In 99:23/24 see N̄ΟΥΠ̄N̄Ā Eϥ̄Ō̄N̄ϩ EϥEINE M̄MΩTN̄ N̄ϩOOYT, which Professor Grobel, *op. cit.*, translates, "'a living spirit, which, like you, is masculine.'" I have adopted this translation above. He comments: "'In Coptic this is *grammatically* true. Is this an argument that 115 (at least) was originally conceived in Coptic, not translated?"

CHAPTER II

THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS AND THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Introduction

At the turn of the century two British scholars, B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, made several remarkable discoveries at the site of ancient Oxyrhynchus, about 120 miles south of Cairo, Egypt. A wealth of Greek papyrus fragments was unearthed, among which were portions of numerous theological and Biblical works of very early times. It was in 1897 that the first important discovery relative to our present task was made. The fragment now known as Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1 contained eight sayings attributed to Jesus, three of them complete but five of them with significant lacunae. The sayings begin with the terse introduction, "Jesus says." Papyrus 1 is the eleventh page of a codex, the writing of which is a fine uncial dating from the early third century A. D.[1] In 1903 the same scholars discovered two other important fragments, numbered in the Oxyrhynchus corpus as Papyri 654 and 655. No. 654 is the beginning of a papyrus scroll, with the writing on the verso side of a land-survey list. It consists of a Prologue (or Preface) and five sayings with a part of a sixth. The fragment is broken down the middle so that only the first half of the forty-two lines it contains is preserved. Here once more the sayings are introduced by "Jesus says." The discoverers also date No. 654 in the third century, probably between 250 and 300 A. D., but not later than 300.[1] Papyrus 655 consists of eight fragments from a scroll. The pieces seem to come from the middles of two narrow columns. The writing is a small uncial most likely not later than 250 A. D.[2] The original editors discerned that 654 and 1 were probably at some time in the same collection of sayings,[3] but the discovery of the Coptic _Gospel of Thomas_ has now made possible a positive identification of all three Greek fragments as portions of the same work. Immediately following the discoveries of Grenfell and Hunt there was a flurry of excitement, understandable in view of the possibility that hitherto unknown sayings of Jesus had been found. A vast body of literature began to be written upon the papyri, the bibliography of which would now take up several pages.[4] Of all the works written, that of Hugh G. Evelyn White[5] remains one of the sanest and most valuable, in addition, of course, to the original editions of the discoverers.

---

[1] The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, IV, 10.

---

[1] Grenfell and Hunt, _op. cit._, pp. 9-10.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 39.

[3] _Ibid._, pp. 9-10.

[4] See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Oxyrhynchus _Logoi_ of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas," _Theological Studies_, XX (December, 1959), 556-60.

[5] _The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhynchus_ (Cambridge: The University Press, 1920).

The importance of the Greek papyri in relation to the Gospel of Thomas is evident. The fact that Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1, 654 and 655 are directly parallel to many sayings in the Coptic collection makes possible our only direct literary comparison. The relationship between the Greek fragments and the Coptic sayings is of such a nature as to establish without a doubt that the Greek papyri are portions of an original collection of sayings mainly identical to Thomas. For the first time we are able to determine the true nature of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri as an extended collection of sayings supposedly from Jesus. It is evident that the Coptic Gospel of Thomas is basically translation Coptic. The numerous Greek words throughout the work where Coptic equivalents could have been used makes this certain. Therefore, the fact that the Oxyrhynchus Papyri are in Greek, coupled with the close relation that they bear to the Gospel of Thomas, shows that the original collection was written in Greek and later translated into Coptic in Egypt. We may now accurately reconstruct the fragmentary Greek sayings for the first time. Moreover, the careful analysis of the similarities and differences between the Greek and Coptic texts suggests considerable revision of the sayings in the process of transmission and helps us more accurately to determine the approximate date of the original Greek collection.

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 654

This fragment should be considered first, since it provides parallels to the Preface, Sayings 1-5, and in part to Saying 6. We shall give a reconstruction of the Greek text, mainly relying upon the Coptic manuscript but in some instances following the suggestions of the discoverers.[1] The figures in the left hand column indicate the numeration of the lines of the papyrus fragment by the editors.

1 οὗτοι οἱ ⟨οἱ⟩ λόγοι οἱ[κρυπτοὶ οὓς ἐλά-]
2 λησεν 'Ιη(σοῦ)ς ὁ ζῶν κ[αὶ Διδύμῳ 'Ιούδᾳ τῷ]
3 καὶ Θωμᾷ καὶ εἶπεν [ὅστις ἑρμηνεί-]
4 αν τῶν λόγων τούτ[ων εὕρῃ τοῦ θανάτου]
5 οὐ μὴ γεύσηται
[λέγει 'Ιη(σοῦ)ς·]
6 μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζη[τῶν ζητεῖν ἕως ἂν]
7 εὕρῃ καὶ ὅταν εὕρῃ [θαμβηθήσεται καὶ θαμ-]
8 βηθεὶς βασιλεύσει κα[ὶ βασιλεύσας ἀναπα-]
9 ήσεται.[2]

For the most part the Preface is easily restored. If the above is adopted, the names of Thomas are exactly as in the Coptic text, but there is not room on the papyrus fragment for a line of this length, nor is it grammatically possible, to have the verb γράφω as the Coptic text suggests, with Thomas as the subject of the verb. An alternate emendation of line 2 would be κ[αὶ ἔδωκεν 'Ιουδᾳ τῷ], which is certainly possible but omits the name Δίδυμος. Another possibility would be to emend the form of the name "Thomas" into the nominative instead of the dative case. It could thus be the subject of the sentence as in the Coptic text:

---

[1] Grenfell and Hunt, op. cit., pp. 11-19.

[2] The translation of the Preface and Saying 1 of the Coptic text is as follows: Preface: "These are the secret words which the Living Jesus spoke and which Didymus-Judas-Thomas recorded. And He (Jesus) said, 'He who finds the interpretation of these words shall not taste death.'" Saying 1: Jesus said, "Let not him who seeks cease seeking until he finds, and whenever he finds he will be disturbed, and whenever he is disturbed he will be amazed, and he will become ruler over all" (all things? the All?).

2 κ[αὶ ἔγραψεν 'Ιουδας δ]
3 καὶ Θωμᾶ[ς].[1]

In any case the restored Greek text would necessarily result in a variant from the Coptic, though it be a minor one. It was suggested by Harnack[2] that another proper name such as Philip or Matthias may have originally been in the text in line 2; this would be in line with the usage in Pistis Sophia I. 42, of these disciples as the recipients of a special revelation: "It came to pass then, when Jesus had heard Philip, that he said unto him: 'Hearken, Philip, blessed one, that I may discourse with thee; for it is thou and Thomas and Matthew on whom it is enjoined by the First Mystery to write all the discourse which I shall speak and [all which I shall] do, and all things which ye shall see.'"[1] However, we are not inclined toward this view in the light of the newer evidence presented by the Gospel of Thomas.

---

[1] Fitzmyer, op. cit., p. 513.

[2] The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, IV, 4, quoted from Harnack, Altchristlichen Literature, I, 14.

While the Introduction may be restored to read very much as in the Coptic text, the same is not true of Saying 1 (lines 5-9). The close parallel between the two texts ceases with the words, "and whenever he finds...." The short gap in line 7 of Papyrus 654 will not permit as extensive an emendation as the parallel in the Gospel of Thomas would indicate, which continues, "and whenever he finds he will be disturbed, and whenever he is disturbed he will be amazed, and he will become ruler over all." It seems best, therefore, to reconstruct Saying 1 as Grenfell and Hunt have done[2] from the citation in Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis V. 14. 97:

> ἶσον γὰρ τούτοις ἐκεῖνα δύναται· οὐ παύσεται ὁ ζητῶν,
> ἕως ἂν εὕρῃ, εὑρὼν δὲ θαμβηθήσεται, θαμβηθεὶς δὲ
> βασιλεύσει, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναπαύσεται.[3]

We shall now reconstruct Saying 2. The conjectures that are based upon the Gospel of Thomas are underlined, and those that are not underlined are from Grenfell and Hunt.

---

[1] Pistis Sophia, A Gnostic Miscellany, trans. G. R. S. Mead (London: John M. Watkins, 1921), p. 58.

[2] New Sayings of Jesus and . . . , p. 13.

[3] Quoted in Alfred Resch, Agrapha. Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente, Neue Folge, Vol. XV of Texte und Untersuchungen (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich's Buchhandlung, 1906), p. 70; Pat. Gr., IX, col. 141.

9 λέγει 'Ι[η(σοῦ)ς· εἰ λέγουσιν]
10 οἱ ἕλκοντες ἡμᾶς [*ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἰδοὺ*]
11 ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρα[νῷ ἐστιν, *ἄρα*]
12 τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρ[ανοῦ καὶ τὰ θηρία ὅ-]
13 τι ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστ[ὶν ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ]
14 οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλά[σσης οὗτοι οἱ *προάγον*-]
15 τες ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἡ βασ[ιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν]
16 ἐντὸς ὑμῶν [ἐ̣]σ̣τι [κ]αὶ ὅστις ἂν ἑαυτὸν]
17 γνῷ ταύτην εὑρή[σει *καὶ γνωσθήσεται*.]
18 ἑαυτοὺς γνώσεσθε [καὶ εἰδήσετε ὅτι υἱοὶ]
19 ἔστε ὑμεῖς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ [*ζῶντος. εἰ δὲ οὐ*]
20 γνώσ[εσ]θε ἑαυτοὺς ἐσ̣[*τε ἐν τῇ πτωχείᾳ*]
21 καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ἡ πτω̣[*χεία*.][1]

This reconstruction is based partially upon considerations made evident by the *Gospel of Thomas*; however, there are some differences that must be accounted for. First there is "those who lead *us*" instead of "those who lead *you*," as in the *Gospel of Thomas*, but the "you" in the remainder of the passage is consistent with the *Gospel of Thomas*. Furthermore, it is significant that the emendations of Grenfell and Hunt

---

[1] Compare with Saying 2 in the Coptic text: Jesus said, "If those who lead you say to you, 'Lo, the kingdom is in the sky,' then the birds of the sky will precede you. If they say to you, 'It is in the sea,' then the fish will precede you. But the kingdom is in your interior and in your exterior. Whenever you know yourselves, then you will be known, and you will understand that you are the sons of the Living Father. But if you do not know yourselves, then you are in poverty and you are poverty."

(or something similar) have to be adopted at certain places to give meaning to the passage, since here Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 654 clearly is not an exact parallel to the Coptic text. For this reason we have included the emendation of the editors for lines 12 and 13 above: ["ṭḥẹ ḅẹạṣṭs tḥ]at ar[ẹ] under the earth [ọr ụp̣ọn ṭḥẹ ẹạṛth ạṇḍ] . . . ."[1]

Then, too, it seems that there is not room in line 16 for the words ["and in your exterior"] as the _Gospel of Thomas_ gives it, whereas the words ["whoever] knows [himself"] are demanded by the context.

The Greek of Saying 3 apparently should be:

21 [λέγει Ἰη(σοῦ)ς·]
22 οὐκ ἀποκνήσει ἄνθ[ρωπος παλαιὸς αὐτοῦ ἡμέ-]
23 ρων ἐπερωτῆσαι πα[ιδίον τῶν ἕπτα ἡμέ-]
24 ρων περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆ[ς ζωῆς καὶ ζή-]
25 σεται ὅτι πολλοὶ ἔσονται π[ρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ]
26 οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ [εἷς μόνος ἔξου-]
27 σιν.[2]

There are two things we should observe here: (1) In line 25, -σετε (for -σεται) is 3 s. future middle indicative (The verb must be ζάω, judging from the _Gospel of Thomas_.).

---

[1] Grenfell and Hunt, _op. cit._, pp. 15, 16.

[2] Saying 3 of the Coptic text: Jesus said, "The man (who is) old in his days will not hesitate to ask a little child who is seven days old about the place of Life, and he shall live; for there are many first who shall be last, and they shall be one only."

The final-ε is Egyptian Greek for -αι. The Coptic text agrees with the Greek at this point. (2) The verbal ending -σιν of line 27 cannot be the 3 pl. future middle indicative of εἰμι; it may be εἰσιν. Thus there seems to be a discrepancy in the tense of the verb. The Coptic has 3 pl. conjunctive following a future, but the Greek may be 3 pl. present indicative. It seems, however, that the Greek verb of the end of line 26 and the beginning of line 27 may be the 3 pl. future active indicative of ἕχω. The verb ἕχω is here intransitive and means "to be" in a certain state or condition.[1] Thus the rendering in the Coptic text would be in accord with the future tense of the Greek verb. Notice also that the Coptic version omits και οἱ ἕσχατοι πρῶτοι.

Saying 4 is reconstructed as follows:

27 λέγει 'Ιη(σοῦ)ς· [γνῶθι τὸν ἔμπροσ-]
28 θεν τῆς ὄψεως σου καὶ [τὸν κεκρθμμένον]
29 ἀπὸ σοῦ ἀποκαλυφ[θ]ήσετ[αί σοι. οὐ γάρ ἐσ-]
30 τιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φ̣α̣ν̣ε̣[ρὸν γενήσεται]
31 καὶ τεθαμμένο̣ν ὃ ο[ὐκ ἐγερθήσεται.][2]

These emendations are identical with those of Grenfell and Hunt[1] with the exception of γνῶθι, line 27, and the substitution of the masculine for the neuter article in lines 27 and 28. Either form of the article may be correct. The Coptic article is ambiguous and offers no help. If Jesus is speaking of Himself as the one who is before the disciples and of the Father as the one who is hidden from them, then the masculine article is correct; if not, the neuter article should stand. The editors of 654 have emended Saying 4 in lines 29b-30 in keeping with Luke 8:17, and have deduced o[ὐκ ἐγερθήσεται as implied by τεθαμμένον. The last clause comprising line 31 is missing from the Gospel of Thomas. On this point Puech asserts that the Coptic text represents a later heterodox revision of a more orthodox original. With Grenfell and Hunt he emends the end of Oxy. Pap. 654:4 with the word indicating the doctrine of the resurrection. He finds added support for this theory as the result of the saying which was found in 1953 on a Christian gravecloth from Oxyrhynchus, which he thinks must have been derived from Oxy. Pap. 654:4. The gravecloth reads as follows: λέγει Ἰησοῦς· οὐκ ἔστιν τεθαμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται.[2] Puech's opinion here seems altogether valid because 654:4 certainly suggests ἐγερθήσεται, while the Coptic version never makes any allusion whatever to the resurrection.

---

[1] See the usage of the verb in the following: Mt. 4:24; Mk. 5:23; 16:18; Jn. 4:52; Acts 7:1; 15:36; 21:13; 24:25; II Cor. 12:14; I Tim. 5:25.

[2] Compare Saying 4 of the Coptic version: Jesus said, "Know Him (Jesus?) who is before your face; and Him (God?) who is hidden from you, He (Jesus?) will reveal to you. For there is nothing hidden which will not be revealed."

---

[1] The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, IV, 8-9. The editors propose an alternate reading [γνωσθήσεται] at the end of line 31, but prefer the above.

[2] Henri-Charles Puech, "Un logion de Jesus sur bandelette funeraire," Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, CXLVII (1955) 126-129. For a full discussion of his views on the two recensions of Thomas, see Edgar Hennecke (ed.), Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher (3d ed. rev.; Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959), pp. 221, 222.

Concerning Saying 5, where parallels exist, the following emendations are suggested by the Gospel of Thomas:

32 [ε̣ξ̣]ετάζουσιν αὐτὸν ο[ἰ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ]
33 [λ̣έ̣]γ̣ο̣υ̣σιν· πῶς νηστεύ[σωμεν καὶ πῶς προσ-]
34 [ε̣υ̣ξ̣ώ̣μ̣]εθα καὶ πῶς [δῶμεν ἐλεημο-]
35 [σ̣ύ̣ν̣η̣ν̣ κ̣α̣]ὶ τί παρατηρήσ[ωμεν, τοῦτ'ἔστι]
36 [φ̣α̣γ̣ε̣ι̣]ν̣ ; λέγει Ἰη(σοῦ)ς· [μὴ ψεύδεσθε καὶ]
37 [ὁ̣ μ̣ι̣σ̣]εῖται μὴ ποιεῖτ̣[ε πάντα γὰρ ἐστι φαν-]
38 [ε̣ρ̣ὸ̣ν̣ τ̣]ῆς ἀληθ̣[ε̣]ίας ἀν[ὰ τὸν οὐρανόν. οὐδὲν
39 [γ̣ά̣ρ̣ ἐ̣σ̣τ̣ι̣]ν̣ ἀ[π̣]οκεκρ̣[υμμένον, δ̀ οὐ φανερω-]
40 [θ̣ή̣σ̣ε̣τ̣α̣ι̣.][1]

This saying is restored with difficulty, but the above seems entirely possible. The verb forms for νηστεύειν, προσεύχεσθαι, and παρατηρεῖν may be either aorist subjunctive or first future, though the subjunctive seems most likely from the standpoint of grammar. Down through line 36 the restorations can be made in accord with the Coptic text. The end of the verb "to hate," which is legible in line 37, seems to be the 3 s. present passive indicative form instead of the second plural as in the Gospel of Thomas, but in Egyptian Greek αι often stands for ε; thus, this is second plural. It should be noticed also that the presence of [τ̣]ῆς ἀληθ̣[ε̣]ίας in line 38 is a departure from what is found in the Gospel of Thomas, where the text simply reads "all things are exposed before heaven." Finally, the last part of the saying in the Gospel of Thomas ("and there is nothing covered which will be left without uncovering it") is absent from the Greek text.

---

[1] Cf. Saying 5 of the Coptic version: His disciples questioned Him, they said to Him, "Do you want us to fast? and how should we pray and give alms? and what should we scrupulously observe, that is, eat?" Jesus said, "Do not lie, and what you hate do not do, because all things are manifest (exposed) before Heaven (God?). For there is nothing hidden which will not be revealed, and there is nothing covered which will be left without uncovering it."

Only a trace of Saying 6 is to be found in Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 654. The following restoration of the Greek text relies wholly upon the Coptic text.

40 μ̣α̣] κ̣άρι[ο̣ς̣] ἐστιν [ὁ λέων ὃν ὁ ἀνὴρ φά-]
41 [γεται καὶ ὁ λέ]ω̣[ν] ἔστ[αι ἀνήρ, καὶ ἀνάθεμά]
42 [ἔστιν ὁ ἀνὴρ] ὃ̣ν̣ [ὁ λέων φάγεται καὶ ὁ]
43 [λέων ἔσται ἀνήρ.][1]

It is possible, of course, that the Greek read differently from the above, but what is given seems probable. It is strange that the conclusion to the second member of the parallel is identical to that of the first member; however, this seems to be intentional.[2] The introductory formula must have been omitted here.

---

[1] The translation of Saying 6 in the Coptic version is as follows: Jesus said, "Blessed is this lion which the man will eat, and the lion will become man; and polluted (hated?) is this man whom the lion will eat, and the lion will become man."

[2] See chap. iv, p. 190.

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1

At this point 654 breaks off. We turn now to a comparison of Papyrus 1:3 and Sayings 27b, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 79b of the _Gospel of Thomas_.

No. 27 of the _Gospel of Thomas_ is complete, but only the conclusion is present in the first saying of Papyrus 1. Here is the Greek test:

1 καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις
2 ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος
3 τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ
4 τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.[2]

We must not fail to notice that the Coptic version is closer to Mt. 7:5, whereas Pap. 1 is closer to Lk. 6:42. This is very important for the relation of _Thomas_ to the Synoptic Gospels, as we shall see.[3]

Let us now consider the parallel between _Gospel of Thomas_ 28 and the second saying of Papyrus 1. The Greek text is complete at this point.

---

[1] _The Oxyrhynchus Papyri_, I, 1-3.

[2] Compare with Saying 27 of the Coptic text: Jesus said, "The chip that is in the eye of your brother you see; but the beam that is in your eye you do not see. Whenever you throw the beam out of your eye, then you will see (how) to throw the chip out of the eye of your brother."

[3] Below, chap. iv, p. 175.

4 λέγει
5 Ἰη(σοῦ)ς· ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύση-
6 ται τὸν κόσμον οὐ μὴ
7 εὕρηται τὴν βασιλεί-
8 αν τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ
9 σαββατίσητε τὸ σάβ-
10 βατον, οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸ(ν)
11 π(ατέ)ρα.[1]

First it is necessary to deal with the conditional clause (line 5) ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε . In the Coptic New Testament the expression ἐὰν μή is rendered frequently by the II present with or without the conditional particle ϢAN-, as in Mt. 5:20 and Mk. 3:27;[2] hence, it would be permissible to translate the Coptic ETETM̄PNHΣTEYE "except you fast" or "if you do not fast." This leads to the observation, then, that the Coptic text here must be dependent upon a Greek text like that of Papyrus 1:2.

But when we come to the object of the verb "fast," it is a different matter. The Greek has the simple accusative (line 6) "the world," but the Coptic has the preposition E- prefixed to "the world." The preposition E- is ambiguous and may mean "to, for, according to, as regards, in order to, towards, against, from," or it may simply indicate the object of the verb and thus is not to be translated.[1] This means that the Greek text from which the Coptic scribe translated at this point was either identical with Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:2, or else had the genitive τοῦ κόσμου,[2] or the dative τῷ κόσμῳ. In view of all the possibilities it is nevertheless most likely that the Greek text behind the Coptic had the accusative, which alone would preserve intact the parallelism of the first member with the second. Therefore, the Coptic scribe's use of the ambiguous preposition would be intentional; "fast the world" would be a literal rendering of the Greek, but "fast *to*, *as regards*, or *from* the world" would all be permissible translations of the Coptic. This is to say that perhaps the scribe left the expression in a state of uncertainty because he was not sure of the meaning of the Greek construction. On the other hand, the expression "fast the world" may have had such a generally understood meaning that it did not require explanation.

---

[1] Compare with Saying 28 of the Coptic text: [Jesus said], "If you do not fast to the world, you shall not find the kingdom; (and) if you do not make the Sabbath to be Sabbath, you shall not see the Father."

[2] The Coptic version of the New Testament, I, 34, 390.

Another point is worthy of notice in comparing the Coptic with the Greek. The Coptic lacks "of God" (line 8) after "the kingdom." One further minor difference distinguishes the Coptic from the Greek; the conjunction "and" between the two parallel members of the saying is missing from the Coptic. From this point on the Coptic text is a literal rendition of a Greek original identical to that of Papyrus 1. It should be noted that the absence of "of God" following "kingdom" by the Coptic scribe makes a strict parallel structure of the saying, moreso than that of the Oxyrhynchus saying. Could this mean that the Coptic text here rested upon a Greek text tradition more primitive and closer to a Semitic prototype than Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:2? It may be that the Gospel of Thomas at points rests upon a Greek text antecedent to the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, but it is doubtful that anything can be made of such a minor variant as this one by itself.

---

[1] Plumly, *op. cit.*, par. 261.

[2] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* III. 15. 31: "μακάριοι οὗτοι εἰσιν, οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες"; *Pat. Gr.*, VIII, col. 1200.

By using Saying 29 of Thomas, the Greek of Papyrus 1:3, may be restored.

11 λέγει 'Ιη(σοῦ)ς· ἔ[σ̣]την
12 ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου
13 καὶ ἐν σαρκεὶ ὤφθην
14 αὐτοῖς καὶ εὗρον πάν-
15 τας μεθύοντας καὶ
16 οὐδένα εὗρον δειψῶ(ν)-
17 τα ἐν αὐτοῖς. καὶ πο-
18 νεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐπὶ
19 τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀν(θρώπ)ων,
20 ὅτι τυφλοί εἰσιν τῇ καρ-
21 δίᾳ αὐτῶ[ν̣] κ̣α̣ὶ [ο̣ὐ̣] βλέπ-

22 [ουσιν ὅτι ἦλθον εἰς τὸν]
23 [κόσμον κενοὶ καὶ ζητοῦ-]
24 [σιν ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ]
25 [κόσμου κενοί. πλὴν νῦν]
26 [μεθύουσιν. ὅταν ἀποτι-]
27 [νάξωσιν τὸν οἶνον αὐτῶν]
28 [τότε μετανοήσουσιν·][1]

The above reconstruction (lines 22-28) has been done by translating the Coptic of Saying 29 back into Greek. There is no way of telling how many lines are missing from the bottom of the page of the papyrus fragment. Grenfell and Hunt stated that the page of an early codex such as this would resemble the high, narrow column of a papyrus roll and that there might be as many as ten lines missing from the bottom of this page.[2] The reconstruction of the Greek confirms this opinion.

Concerning the analysis of the differences between the Coptic and Greek texts, there is a minor departure in the Gospel of Thomas from the word order of lines 13 and 14. The Greek has, "and in flesh I was seen by them" (or, "I appeared to them"); the Coptic reads, "and I appeared to them in flesh."

---

[1] Translation of Saying 29 of the Coptic: Jesus said, "I stood in the midst of the world, and I appeared to them in [fles]h. I found them all drunken; I found no one among them thirsty, and my soul gri[ẹṿ]ed over the sons of men because they are blind in their heart and they do not see that they came into the world empty. They also seek to go out of the world empty, only now they are drunken. Whenever they cast off their wine, then they will repent."

[2] The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, I, 1-3.

Note also that the conjunction "and" at the end of line 15 is missing from Thomas. There is another minor difference in the word order in lines 16 and 17. The Greek reads (literally), "No one I found thirsty among them;" the Coptic says, "I found no one among them thirsty." These differences in word order may not mean much. They could be the normal changes to be expected in a translation from one language to another, but a more important consideration has to do with the order of words in a Coptic sentence. The normal order (auxiliary with subject, verbal form, object, dative, adverb) is followed in the Coptic text at this point. Occasionally the adverb is placed at the beginning of the sentence, but this is mostly due to the influence of Greek originals.[1]

Thus far, the differences from the Greek text are slight, but now a more significant departure is plain. The Greek has the present active indicative for the verb "grieve, suffer," but the Coptic utilizes the I perfect tense. The Coptic scribe could have been responsible for this if the Greek text which he used did indeed have the present form. The Coptic is consistent in using the perfect (past) tense, whereas the Greek is inconsistent, and the present form of "grieve" could have been due to an error. However, note also the present of the verb "to be" in line 20 above. Here Thomas lacks a verb, using a non-verbal construction that may be translated either present or past. Apparently the context would demand the past, though the historical present, as in the Greek text, would be permissible. Beyond these considerations it is impossible to know what further differences may have existed in the lost portion of the Greek fragment. If it be asked what purpose reconstructing the Greek in lines 22-27 has served, the answer is that it confirms the judgment of Grenfell and Hunt on the length of the page of Papyrus 1 as it originally stood. More important still is the fact that the sense of the lost portion of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:3, has been preserved in the Gospel of Thomas.

---

[1] Plumley, op. cit., pars. 318, 335.

So far as seeking to reconstruct the Greek of Saying 30 (parallel to Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:4) is concerned, that would serve no useful purpose here. Only a portion of the last line of this saying is extant in the Greek fragment. It is found on line 1 of the recto side of the papyrus. Grenfell and Hunt make out only the following letters: ....]ην πτωχείαν.

This ending shows that the same order was followed in both the Oxyrhynchus and the Coptic collections at this point. Doubtless line 1 of the recto side may be filled out as [εἰς ταύτ]ην πτωχείαν. This further establishes that the number of lines on the page originally extended even beyond the 28 required by the full text of Saying 29.

We come next to Papyrus 1:5, parallel to Gospel of Thomas 31 and 79b. Here there are some interesting differences.

It should be kept in mind that the brief lacunae of the Greek text will not permit a reconstruction along the lines of Saying 31 of the Gospel of Thomas. Furthermore, the second part of the Oxyrhynchus saying is found, not in Gospel of Thomas 31, but in 79b! Herewith follows the reconstruction of Papyrus 1:5a, given by Grenfell and Hunt:

2 [λέγ]ει [Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς· ὅπ]ου ἐὰν ὦσιν
3 [β΄, οὐκ] ε[ἰσὶ]ν̣ ἄ̣θ̣εοι, καὶ
4 [ὅ̣]π̣ου̣ ε[ἷς] ἐστιν μόνος,
5 [λέ]γω· ἐγώ εἰμι μετ᾽ αὐ-
6 τ[οῦ].[1]

Gospel of Thomas 31 is translated: "Where there are three godly ones, they are in God; where there are two or one, I, myself, am with him."[2] It has already been postulated that there may have been a common ancestor of these two versions, which would explain the origin of the variants.[3]

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:5b, is as follows:

6 ἔγει[ρ]ον τὸν λίθο(ν)
7 κακεῖ εὑρήσεις με·
8 σχίσον τὸ ξύλον, κἀγὼ

---

[1] The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, I, 1-3.

[2] See the translation where the reasons for this rendering are given. So far as I know, no other Coptic scholars have translated No. 31 in any way except this: "Where there are three gods, they are gods . . .," cf. The Gospel according to Thomas, p. 21.

[3] Above, chap. i, p. 27.

9 ἐκεῖ εἰμι.

The parallel in Gospel of Thomas 79b, while not differing on content, reverses the parallel members from the above order: "Split the wood, and I am there; lift the stone, and you will find me there." A variant of this type, together with the differences between Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:5a and Gospel of Thomas 31, suggests dependence by the Coptic scribe upon a Greek text different from that of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1. One would be inclined to think that in the case of Saying 79b the Coptic text represents a later stage of transmission than does Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:5b because 79b is more clearly pantheistic in relation to 79a than in relation to 31. It would seem but natural that in the later stages of transmission such sayings would be more thoroughly gnosticized.

Papyrus 1:6 and Saying 32 are essentially the same. The following may be compared with Gospel of Thomas 32 and will show that the minor differences in word order are due only to the customary ordering of Coptic sentences, not to any basic textual variant:

9 λέγει 'Ι(ησοῦ)ς· οὐ-
10 κ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προ-
11 φήτης ἐν τῇ π(ατ)ρίδι αὐ-
12 τοῦ, οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ
13 θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς
14 γεινώσκοντας αὐτό(ν).[1]

---

[1] Cf. Saying 32 of the Coptic version: Jesus said, "There is no prophet accepted in his own village; a physician is not wont to cure those who know him."

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:7 is parallel to _Gospel of Thomas_ 33. The Greek text is rather close to the Coptic, but there are a few minor differences.

15 λέγει 'I(ησοῦ)ς· πόλις οἰδοδο-
16 μημένη ἐπ'ἄκρον
17 [ὄ]ρους ὑψηλῦς καὶ ἐσ-
18 τηριγμένη οὔτε πε-
19 [σ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε κρυ-
20 [β]ῆναι.[1]

In the first place, the _Gospel of Thomas_ either fails to translate "top" in line 16 or else the Greek text upon which it was dependent did not have the word. Further, the balanced structure of Papyrus 1:7, οὔτε . . . οὔτε , is replaced by MN̄ ϬOM N̄ΣϨE OYΔE ΣNAϢ ϨΩΠ AN. This may be the Coptic scribe's independent way of rendering the Greek, but it seems that he would have used οὔτε if it had been in the Greek text before him.

Not much remains of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1:8, and in view of what can be made out, nothing more than the following is of any benefit here:

20 λέγει 'I(ησοῦ)ς· ἀκούεις
21 [ε]ἰ̣ς τ̣ὸ ἐ̣[ν ὠ]τ̣ίον σοῦ τ̣ο̣[2]

---

[1] Cf. Saying 33 of _Thomas_: Jesus said, "A city built upon a high mountain and made fast cannot fall nor will it be able to be hidden."

[2] Saying 34 of _Thomas_ is translated as follows: Jesus said, "What you will hear with your ear, in the other ear proclaim it upon (from?) your roofs. For one is not wont to put it in a concealed place; but he is wont to put it upon the lampstand so that everyone who comes in and goes out may see its light."

Here line 21 is given as it has been previously reconstructed, but I suggest [ο] ἰ̣ς τ̣ο ἐν ὠ]τίον σοῦ as more consistent with Gospel of Thomas 34. Yet, notice the present tense of "hear" in the Greek test and the I future in the Coptic, and the plural of "what" in the Greek as contrasted with the singular in the Coptic.

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 655

The third fragment from Oxyrhynchus is Papyrus 655, which consists of eight fragments from a scroll. The first fragment and part of the second are akin to Gospel of Thomas 37, though the latter is a very abbreviated form of the saying. Grenfell and Hunt reconstruct Papyrus 655:1 as follows:

λέγει Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς· μὴ μεριμνᾶ-
1 [τε ἀ]π̣ὸ πρ̣ωὶ ἕ[ως ὄψε]
2 [μήτ]ε ἀ̣φ' ἑσπ[έρας]
3 [ἕως π]ρωὶ μήτε [τῇ]
4 [τροφῇ ὑ]μ̣ῶν τί φά̣-
5 [γητε μήτε] τῇ στ[ο-]
6 [λῇ ὑμῶν] τί ἐνδ̣ύ̣-
7 [ση]σ̣θ̣ε̣. [πολ]λῷ κρε̣ί̣[σ-]
8 [σον]ές [ἐστε] τῶν [κρί-]
9 νω̣ν ἅτι[να α]ὐ̣ξά̣-
10 νει οὐδ̣ὲ ν̣[ήθ]ε̣ι̣· [....]
11 ἓν ἔ̣χ̣ο̣ντ[ες ἔ]ν̣δ̣[υ-]
12 μα τ̣ί ἐ̣ν[....] κ̣αὶ

13 ὑμεῖς; τίς ἂν προσθ[εί]η
14 ἐπὶ τὴν εἰλικ̣ί[α]ν
15 ὑμῶν; αὐτὸ[ς δ]ώσ̣[ε]ι
16 ὑμεῖν τὸ ἔνδυμα ὑ-
17 μῶν.[1]

Gospel of Thomas 37 contains only the words "Take no care (thought) from morning to evening and from evening to morning what you shall put on." One of two possibilities exists: (1) Either the Greek text used by the Coptic scribe did not contain these words, or (2) else the scribe omitted the bulk of the original and modified it into the short saying of No. 37. At any rate the shorter version suits the more heterodox recension of the sayings represented by the Coptic work better than the longer one of Oxy. Pap. 655:1. Saying 37 is more effective in stressing the sexual views of the community.[2]

The next part of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 655 contains approximately half the saying that is found in Gospel of Thomas 38. This part of the fragment is in good condition down through line 23.

17 λέγουσιν αὐ-

---

[1] Oxyrhynchus Papyri, IV. 23, 24. I have added μὴ μεριμνᾶτε at the beginning, which, except for the last two letters, probably was written upon the part of the roll that no longer exists.

[2] Below, chaps. iii, v, vi.

18 τῷ οἱ μαθηται αὐτοῦ.
19 πότε ἡμεῖν ἐμφα-
20 νὴς ἔσει καὶ πότε
21 σε ὀψόμεθα; λέγει·
22 ὅταν ἐκδύσησθε κ̣α̣ὶ̣
23 μὴ αἰσ̣χυ̣ν̣θῆτε[1]

There are four variants in *Thomas* from the extant portion of the Greek text here: (1) As usual the Coptic has the perfect tense in the introductory formula against the present active indicative in the Greek.[2] (2)The Coptic has "strip yourselves of your shame" in contrast to μὴ αἰσχυνθῆτε (line 23). (3) The Coptic omits translating αὐτῷ (line 17/18). (4) The Coptic has "Jesus said," where the Greek has only λέγει (line 21). There is no way of determining whether Papyrus 655 continued along the same pattern as Saying 38. The smallest pieces of Papyrus 655 offer no help since only isolated letters can be made out, none of which would fit a reconstruction parallel to Saying 38. It is very likely, however, that Papyrus 655 did continue as Saying 38, and, if so, the following reconstruction of the Greek text is not out of place:

---

[1] Translation of *G. of Thomas* 38: His disciples said, "On what day will you be revealed to us and on what day shall we see you?" Jesus said, "Whenever you strip yourselves of your shame and take your garments and put them under your feet, like little children, and tread upon them, the[ṇ yọu sḥạḷḷ ḅe] sons of the Living One and you shall not be afraid."

[2] This is true throughout all three of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 654, 1, and 655.

23 [καὶ]
24 [λάβητε τὰ ἐνδύματα]
25 [ὑμῶν καὶ θῆτε αὐτὰ]
26 [ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν]
27 [ὡς τεκνία καὶ καταπα-]
28 [τήσητε ἐπὶ αὐτῶν, τότε]

Col. ii.

1 [ἔσεσθε οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ζῶν-]
2 [τος καὶ οὐ μὴ φοβηθήσεσθε].

This indicates the likelihood that the columns of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 655 extended to about 28 lines, which length was not uncommon in papyrus scrolls.

Of Saying 39 there is no trace in Papyrus 655, but since the same general arrangement of the sayings is found in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri as in the Gospel of Thomas, we may assume that a parallel to Saying 39 followed 655:2. If the reconstruction of the remainder of the Greek parallel to Saying 38 did fill out the first column of 655, then the following reconstruction of Saying 39 would fit perfectly into the lacunae at the top of the second column. This would displace fragment (c) from the position given to it by Grenfell and Hunt. Since (c) contains so few letters that can be deciphered, it is unlikely that its original position in the roll may be discovered. Therefore we submit the following as what probably originally constituted the last word of line 2 and the eight or nine lines following.

2 [λέγει]
3 ['Ι(ησοῦ)ς· πολλάκις ἐπεθυμή-]
4 [σατε ἀκούειν τούτους]
5 [λόγους οὓς λέγω ὑμῖν,]
6 [καὶ οὐκ ἔσχετε ἕτερον]
7 [ὑπὸ οὗ ἀκούειν αὐτούς.]
8 [ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ἐν]
9 [αἷς ζητήσετε ἐμὲ καὶ]
10 [οὐκ εὑρήσετε . . .][1]

Turning now to the last portion of Papyrus 655 that is of any value for our purposes, we notice that it is parallel to Saying 40. Reconstructing the Greek on the basis of the Coptic text we have the following:

10 [λέ-]
11 [γει 'Ι(ησοῦ)ς· οἱ φαρισαῖ-]
12 [οι καὶ γραμματεῖς]
13 ἔλ[αβον τὰς κλεῖδας]
14 τῆς[γνώσεως καὶ]
15 ἔκρυψ[αν αὐτάς. οὐκ]
16 εἰσῆλ̣[θον καὶ τοῖς]
17 εἰσερ[χομένοις οὐ-]

---

[1] The above reconstruction is dependent on Saying 39 of Thomas, the translation of which follows: Jesus said, "Many times you desired to hear these words which I am saying to you, and you had not another by whom to hear them. Days are coming when you shall seek me and not find me."

18 ϰ ἀν[έψξαν. ὑμεῖς]

19 δὲ γει[νεσθε φρόνι-]

20 μοι ὡ[ς οἱ ὄφεις καὶ ἀ-]

21 ϰέραι[οι ὡς περιστε-]

22 ρ̣α̣[ι.][1]

The above obviously is not in entire accord with Saying 40. What exists of this part of the fragment will not permit an exact parallel to Saying 40 beyond line 15 of Papyrus 655. The Gospel of Thomas has, "they neither went in nor did they permit those who wished to go in;" the reconstructed Greek text has, "They did not go in and to the ones who were entering they did not open."[2] Both of these readings are closer to Mt. 23:13 than to Lk. 12:52 and seem to be different versions of the same saying. Otherwise the two parallel texts are very close to each other in phraseology.

Conclusion

The preceding collation and reconstruction may seem tedious, but it is not without significance.[3] There are nineteen parallel sayings between the Gospel of Thomas and the three Oxyrhynchus Papyri examined above. Out of these nineteen parallels, sixteen of them contain at least one variant from its corresponding member. There are approximately thirty-eight variants in all, not counting one that is found in each of the extant Oxyrhynchus sayings, which is the use of the present indicative in the introductory formulae over against the use of the I perfect in the Coptic text. Not all of these thirty-eight variants are of great moment; some may be due to the normal liberties a scribe would assume as his prerogative in translating from another language. But the large number and the nature of the variants are of significance. For example, there are only two instances where the Gospel of Thomas contains significant data not to be found in the parallel Greek fragments, whereas there are nine important readings (possibly ten) in the Greek text of which no trace is found in the Gospel of Thomas. One conclusion that may be drawn is that in the process of copying and translating the collection variants have come about by free manipulation of the text. This is precisely what one would expect in the Gnostic community which utilized the collection, and we may be assured that numerous intentional alterations have occurred.

---

[1] Cf. Saying 40: Jesus said, "The Pharisees and the Scribes have taken the keys of knowledge (and) hidden them; they neither went in nor did they permit those who whished to go in. But you, be wise as serpents and harmless (innocent) as doves."

[2] Grenfell and Hunt, op. cit., p. 41, were correct in completing the verbs except that they should be 3 pl. instead of 2 sing.

[3] See Appendix A for a complete summary of the collation.

Nevertheless, there are some differences that are of such a nature as to make another observation certain, and that is that the text tradition represented by Thomas (excluding intentional alterations) is not identical with that of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. This is to say that in certain places the Greek manuscript that was utilized by the Coptic translators was different from the tradition known through the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. In such cases the translation found in Thomas may have been given as a relatively faithful rendering of the Greek. The most important variant illustrating this fact is found by a comparison of Papyrus 1:5 and Saying 31 of Thomas. As we have seen,[1] both versions must have been derived from a common ancestor.

The comparative study of the relation of Thomas to the Oxyrhynchus Papyri is therefore suggestive for dating the original Greek collection. As for the Coptic version, it is not possible to date it accurately by means of Coptic paleography. Various scholars have proposed dates from the first half of the third century to the beginning of the sixth century.[2] The radical syncretism of the Coptic version undoubtedly makes it later than the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, which are all from the third century. One of the fragments (Papyrus 1) comes from the early third century, but if Thomas is at least partially dependent upon a Greek collection antecedent to the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, then the date of this original collection must be pushed back well into the second century A. D. This judgment is further verified by the literary parallels from the second century that are examined in the next chapter.

---

[1] Above, chap. i, p. 27.

[2] Fitzmyer, op. cit., p. 508.

Let us return for a moment to the question of the treatment of the various sayings in the process of transmission by the religious community. The evidence shows that while the separate collections were similar, the sayings were treated with considerable freedom. Where it suited the purposes of the religious community, there seems to have been little hesitancy in molding the sayings to support a particular point of view. Since one of our first tasks is to understand the collection from the standpoint of the community which made use of it, we are led directly into the material of the next two chapters. There an attempt will be made to determine the "Sitz im Leben" of the sayings and to draw significant conclusions pertaining to both canonical and non-canonical data.

PART II. SITZ IM LEBEN

CHAPTER III

LITERARY GENRE AND RELATIONSHIPS TO SECOND AND THIRD CENTURY LITERATURE

Introduction

The preceding chapter demonstrated that the *Gospel of Thomas* is a text with a history. It has been redacted during the process of its transmission, and certainly numerous factors have been operative in this process. While we are not able to delineate the textual history of the document except in a general way, we may yet learn a number of facts of importance that will give us a greater understanding of it. At this point both internal and external evidence (other than the Oxyrhynchus Papyri) will be brought into focus.

We shall first examine the problem of the structure of the collection in order to determine whether any significant data may be uncovered that would show any hidden meaning in the form of the collection. We shall be concerned also with the reason for calling the collection a "Gospel." In what sense is it such, and what are the implications of the use of *evangelion* to describe this type of literature? Moreover, we must ask whether the *Gospel of Thomas* has any relation to "Q" and Papias' Matthaean *Logia*, and whether any literary precedents may have existed for such a collection as *Thomas* represents. On the basis of internal evidence we shall designate what general category of literature the Gospel of Thomas falls into, and we shall theorize on the use of the document in the religious community. There is some evidence from the Pistis Sophia and Irenaeus' Adversus Haereses which is quite important. This evidence shows that the Gospel of Thomas was not composed to serve a literary but a religious function of the greatest significance. We shall next examine the points of contact between the collection and other pieces of second and third century literature, being interested in both direct literary connections and reflections of similar theological ideas. Two apocryphal gospels are especially pertinent here, the Gospel of the Hebrews and the Gospel of the Egyptians. For example, we shall see that while there may be points of contact with the Gospel of the Hebrews, they are not of such a nature as to warrant any sweeping conclusions; namely, that we have a wholesale lifting of sayings from Hebrews to make up the Gospel of Thomas.[1] So also with the Gospel of the Egyptians; we are not justified in asserting that a great many passages were taken from this work. At the same time, both doctrinal and literary connections with the latter gospel seem to be somewhat more significant than in the case of Hebrews. This is especially true with respect to the community's views on sex.

---

[1] Gilles Quispel, "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament," Vigiliae Christianae, XI (December, 1957), 189-207.

Having dealt with the above matters, we shall then come to Gnosticism proper by examining the possible connections with Basilides or his followers, the Naassenes, the *Poimandres* tractate, the Valentinian *Gospel of Truth*, the *Pistis Sophia*, and the Manichaean writings. The relationships here are very meaningful, not simply for the purpose of establishing literary parallels, but more so in order to determine the basic orientation of the community which produced and/or used the *Gospel of Thomas*. Hence, we are involved in the attempt to establish the "Sitz im Leben" of the individual sayings, and, if possible, of the collection as a whole. The investigation will show that the basic orientation of the document is Gnostic. The affinities with Naassene theology are perhaps the strongest, but there are also similarities in basic theological presuppositions that the collection holds in common with other Gnostic schools of thought. Finally, we shall consider the implications of the connections of the *Gospel of Thomas* with the Manichaean literature. In spite of the fact that the Manichaean writings are later than *Thomas*, there is one piece of evidence that establishes the place of the origin of the collection. We now move to the detailed exposition of these matters.

The Structure of the Collection

What may we learn from the way in which the *Gospel of Thomas* is put together? A careful analysis based upon both qualitative and quantitative factors does not yield very much of value. There seems to be no obvious pattern in the collection from the standpoint of content, nor is there any logic to the arrangement by the sizes of the units. If there is a hidden meaning to the overall structure, it is too obscure to be found. There are, however, limited groupings, which variously depend upon catchwords, similarity of content, or the throwing together of parables. As G. Garitte has observed, there is one special grouping which shows a catchword sequence (Sayings 60-63). In 60 and 61 the key words are "life," "Living One," "live." No. 61 also mentions "die," and this leads into 62, where the "killing" of a lamb is mentioned, and it closes with "a resting-place." Saying 63 begins by mentioning "two . . . at rest upon one bed," then one of them "dies," and continues with Salome saying to Jesus that he "lay" upon her "bed." Such a grouping seems to point toward a process of oral transmission, whereby the student's memory was aided by an arrangement of sayings according to certain key words.[1] We may point out an alternate possibility; namely, that the sayings were arranged as indicated in the document itself to aid catechumens who were instructed from it. Aside from this feature, the collection seems to be formless, with no great significance to be attached to the overall structure.

---

[1] G. Garitte, "Le premier volume de l'edition photographique des manuscrits gnostiques coptes et l'Evangile de Thomas," _Le Museon_, LXX (1957), 63-64, quoted in Grant and Freedman, _op. cit._, p. 104.

The Collection as a "Gospel"

The term "Gospel" is not to be taken in the same sense as it is understood in the New Testament. In Gnostic circles the word was used rather loosely to designate both apocryphal lives of Jesus and mysterious revelations of the celestial world. Here it is applied to a document of a different order. The collection has no narratives about Jesus. Not a single episode from his career is mentioned. Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas is a heavenly being, a supernatural revealer, and "*evangelion* is in this type of literature a designation of 'secret sayings which the living Jesus spoke' and which make sense only for those who are able to interpret them."[1] The emphasis upon the interpretation (ἑρμηνεία) of the sayings, the meanings of which are taken to be obscure and difficult to understand, verifies this judgment.

Three Questions

We must attempt to answer the following questions: (1) Does the collection have any direct relation to the hypothetical "Q" used by Matthew and Luke? (2) Is there any connection with the so-called Matthean "Logia" mentioned by Papias, who is said to have written a five-volume commentary upon them?[2] (3) What other historical precedents may have existed that gave rise to a collection of this type? Concerning the first question, we must defer treatment of a possible relationship to "Q" to Chapter IV. As for Papias we shall be skeptical of his testimony for two reasons: (1) Eusebius says of Papias: Σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν, ὡς ἂν ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων τεκμηράμενον εἰπεῖν, φαίνεται .[1] (2) If so important a collection of sayings of Jesus did exist, it seems unlikely that all traces of it would have vanished except what is now available in the Gospel of Thomas. With regard to the third question, we may refer to the opinion of Hugh G. Evelyn White relative to the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, which opinion applies as well to the Gospel of Thomas since the connection of the Greek and Coptic texts is well established. He points out that it is not impossible that the collection was patterned after the Jewish Pirke Abot, a treatise primarily ethical in nature, comprising pithy sentences of teachers belonging to different periods.[2] He adds that there was also an Egyptian precedent for recording the virtues and teachings of famous men, and therefore it is not necessary to assume a Hebraic model for the collection. From Egypt has come the Apophthegmata

---

[1] Otto A. Piper, "The Gospel of Thomas," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIII (October, 1959), 19.

[2] Eusebius *H. E.* III. 39. 16 and II. 39. 1.

---

[1] Ibid., III. 39. 13; Pat. Gr., XX, col. 300. We give here our translation of the above citation: "For he indeed appears to be extremely weak of intellect, as is discerned from his discourses." See also Irenaeus Adv. Haer. V. 33. 3, 4, for the bizarre agraphon on the millennium reported by Papias.

[2] The Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Isidore Singer (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1901), I, 81-82.

Patrum, stories and sayings of famous Christian hermits and monks of the desert.[1] There is also extant a collection of very ancient sayings, "The Instruction of the Vizier Ptah-hotep," which goes back to the Fifth Dynasty (about 2450 B.C.).[2] White concludes that there was ample precedent in an Egyptian environment for the formation of such a collection of the sayings of Jesus.[3] We should remark, however, that the Apophthegmata Patrum is of a later date and of a rather different order than the Gospel of Thomas and thus is not itself a precedent for our collection. As for "The Instruction of the Vizier Ptah-hotep," it would appear to be too far removed in time and substance to serve as a model for the Gospel of Thomas. Perhaps it is futile to look for a pre-existing model, since we may likely find evidence within and without the collection that provides ample motive for its formation.

Type of Literature and Usage in the Community

"Wisdom" Literature.--The Gospel of Thomas is a kind of wisdom literature, though not in the Biblical sense. Its import is much too cryptic to fit the Biblical category. However, along with others in the early church, the community which utilized the Gospel of Thomas realized that many of the sayings of Jesus involved μυστήρια not to be encountered on ordinary levels of experience.[1] In contrast to the more orthodox Christians the Gnostics interpreted the various

---

[1] See The Paradise of the Holy Fathers, trans. Ernest A. Wallis Budge (2 vols.; New York: Duffield and Company, 1909).

[2] "The Instruction of the Vizier Ptah-hotep," trans. John A. Wilson, in James B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950), pp. 412-14.

[3] White, op. cit., pp. xxv, xxvi.

> layers of reality in psychological terms as an hierarch of mental faculties, the supreme of which was identical with the activity of the divine origin in man [whereas] the church started from the idea of a divine creator. Accordingly they differentiated between a heavenly and an earthly reality, and a number of graded intermediaries between God and man each of which being endowed with a specific power. The _Gospel of Truth_ discloses its gnostic character frankly by discussing man's ability to become aware of the supranatural powers of his mind. The meaning of the _Gospel of Thomas_ is not so obvious. We may safely presume that, nevertheless, at least in its final stage, it was understood in the same way as the _Gospel of Truth_. However what it actually provides are but the signs and symbols of this higher wisdom, while the disclosure of their meaning was probably reserved to oral instruction.[2]

Instruction of Initiates.--In the light of several pieces of evidence we may conclude with more than a degree of probability that the _Gospel of Thomas_ was used as a text upon which a teacher might expound, giving oral instruction for the disclosure of its hidden meanings. The text itself and certain literary parallels leave the impression that the collection was used to instruct catechumens or initiates in the religious community. For example, one wonders whether the fabricated dialogue between the heavenly Jesus and the disciples in the Pistis Sophia may not offer a clue to the way in which the sayings in the Gospel of Thomas were used. In the Pistis Sophia the so-called repentances of the fallen Aeon are given, and then one from the group of disciples comes forward to Jesus to declare the interpretation. The interpreter usually quotes one of the Old Testament Psalms or one of the Odes of Solomon and explains, "This is the solution of the mystery of the repentance of Pistis Sophia," or gives a similar utterance.[1] The dialogue form of the Pistis Sophia may be more than a literary device and may reflect the actual method of instruction within the Gnostic community, although this cannot be proved. Thus a particular saying from the Gospel of Thomas may have been recited, which was followed by oral instruction on the deeper meaning of the saying, and the initiate learned both the saying and the interpretation.[2]

---

[1] Mk. 4:11-12. ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐκείνος δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται, ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

[2] Piper, _op. cit_., p. 20.

We may move a step further with regard to the community's use of the Gospel of Thomas. While the substance of the collection is by no means homogeneous, there is at least one of the sayings which seems to be related to the secret knowledge that the Gnostic must possess if he is to pass unmolested through the spheres of the various planetary beings on his ascent back to the highest order of being. It is No. 52:

---

[1] Pistis Sophia, A Gnostic Miscellany, p. 45. Only Books I and II deal with the Aeon Pistis Sophia.

[2] From what we know of Gnostic teachings, some of the fabricated utterances put into the mouth of Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas suggest their own interpretation, while others present a real problem with regard to their intended meaning. At the same time we must recognize the possibility that some of the sayings were simply taken at their face value without any attempt to elaborate upon them.

> Jesus said, "If they ask you, 'Whence have you come?' say to them, 'We came out of the light, from the place out of which the light came [there] from him (?) alone. He [became . . . revealed (?)] in their image.' If they say to you, 'Are you he?' say, 'We are his sons, and we are the elect of the living Father.' If they ask you, 'What is the sign of [y]our Father which (who?) is in you?' say to them, 'It (He?) is a movement and a rest.'"

There are several points of resemblance between No. 52 and a citation of Irenaeus in his discussion of the Marcosians. He refers explicitly to the Gnostic belief of the passage of the soul at death through the "principalities and powers," which is part of the salvation process:

> And they instruct them, on their reaching the principalities and powers, to make use of these words: 'I am a son from the Father--the Father who had a pre-existence, and a son in Him who is pre-existent. I have come to behold all things, both those which belong to myself and others, although, strictly speaking, they do not belong to others, but to Achamoth, who is female in nature, and made these things for herself. For I derive being from Him who is pre-existent, and I come again to my own place whence I went forth.'[1]

---

[1] Adv. Haer. I. 21. 5.

In spite of the differences between the two passages, the similarities are obvious. In both instances the Gnostic identifies himself as a "son of the Father," he declares his place of origin (and in the Marcosian teaching his destiny also), and he is instructed in a special type of knowledge. For the Marcosian it is clearly a sort of password instruction, and in Saying 52 the same thing may be implied. It is possible, however, that in No. 52 we have a form which was not originally related to this type of teaching but was easily adapted to it. The similarities between the two citations does not prove literary dependence of the one upon the other but does suggest the existence of a kind of teaching method common to both groups in terms of form and content. Admittedly Saying 52 is only one case among many others in the collection which had a variety of applications, but the facts indicated above demonstrate that the document as a whole served as a teaching instrument for the religious community. We can imagine a teacher of catechumens or initiates holding the Gospel of Thomas before him, reading from it, and then discussing its meaning with the group.

Literary and Sectarian Connections

The Gospel According to the Hebrews.--In some respects the relationship of the Gospel of Thomas with Hebrews is a problem too difficult and complex to be dealt with, for it touches upon the elusive nature of the Gospel According to the Hebrews. Scholars disagree on the precise nature of it because of the confusing statements made with regard to its contents by writers such as Epiphanius, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Jerome. A. F. Findlay suggests that the title According to the Hebrews was correctly applied to only one work but was erroneously applied to others which had nothing in common except their currency among Christians of Hebrew or Semitic origin.[1] The evidence of the Chenoboskion library tends to verify this judgment because among the Gnostics, at least, titles were shifted from one work to the other. Doresse has pointed out that in this Coptic Gnostic library there are two copies of the same work (Documents No. 2 and No. 7), one of which bears the title The Sacred Book of the Great Invisible Spirit and the other entitled The Gospel of the Egyptians.[2] This work is not, however, the same as that called According to the Egyptians by Clement of Alexandria.[3] It is not outside the realm of possibility that the same thing happened in the case of the Gospel According to the Hebrews.

From the available data we know that the Gospel According to the Hebrews dealt with Jewish-Christian traditions and had some connections with the Ebionites. When we speak of

---

[1] Byways in Early Christian Literature (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1923), pp. 33, 34.

[2] Doresse, op. cit., pp. 197, 198.

[3] Stromateis III. 13. 92; III. 9. 63, trans. in M. R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924), pp. 11, 12.

"Jewish-Christian traditions" several things are indicated as general characteristics of the Jewish-Christians: (1) The place of preeminence given to James, bishop of the Jerusalem church and brother of Jesus. (2) The use of the Gospel of Matthew only.[1] (3) An anti-Pauline, legalistic, strongly Judaistic theology. (4) Belief in an adoptionist Christology.[2] We refer to the Gospel of the Hebrews as having some relation to the Ebionite movement because, according to Epiphanius, it was used by them.[3] If M. J. Lagrange is correct, the Ebionite version known to Epiphanius is nothing more than a radical working over of canonical Matthew;[4] that is, an even more radical adaptation of Matthew than that which we find among the Jewish-Christians known through other patristic sources. Our present concern, therefore, has to do with the possibility of (1) literary connections between Thomas and the Hebrew Gospel (known only by various patristic citations of it) and (2) of reflections in Thomas of a Jewish-Christian theological perspective.[5]

---

[1] In a revised form. See M. J. Lagrange, "L' Evangile selon les Hebreux," Revue Biblique, XXXI (April, 1922), 161-181.

[2] See the summary of the patristic evidence in Hans Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (3rd. ed. rev.; London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), pp. 181-190.

[3] Epiphanius Haer. XXX. 3; Pat. Gr., XLI, col. 409.

[4] Lagrange, loc. cit.

[5] In a series of articles Gilles Quispel has sought to prove the existence of a Semitic Jewish-Christian tradition

In Chapter II, p. 62, we observed that Saying 1 is parallel to a citation of the Gospel of the Hebrews in Clement of Alexandria. The two citations are placed side by side to show the resemblances and differences.

Saying 1	From G. of the Hebrews
Let not him who seeks cease seeking until he finds, and whenever he finds he will be disturbed, and whenever he is disturbed he will be	He shall not cease from seeking until he find, and having found, he will be
amazed, and he will become ruler over all.	amazed, and having been amazed will reign, and having reigned will rest.[1]

This parallel indicates some relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel According to the Hebrews, but we cannot define that relationship with any great assurance. The

---

of the sayings of Jesus going back originally to the primitive Palestinian community. He believes this tradition to be older in some respects than our canonical Gospels. He thinks there are authentic sayings of Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas derived from this tradition. Through an intricate analysis of the so-called "Western Text," the various Diatessara, the patristic references to the Hebrew and the Egyptian Gospels, and the Pseudo-Clementine Literature (II Clement, Clementine Homilies and Recognitions), he attempts to prove the existence of this tradition and the dependence of the Gospel of Thomas upon it through the media of the Gospels of the Hebrews and of the Egyptians. He maintains that the synoptic-like or Semitic type utterances in our collection were extracted from these two apocryphal gospels. While there may be some credence to this line of argument, the findings in this chapter and in the succeeding one considerably modify this view. For Quispel's views see Vigiliae Christianae, XI (December, 1957), 189-207; XII (December, 1958), 181-96; XIII (July, 1959), 87-117; New Testament Studies, V (July, 1959), 276-90.

[1] Stromateis V. 14. 96, quoted in James, op. cit., p. 2. We have used James' translation because it is more faithful to the Greek participles.

shorter citation of the same saying in Clement of Alexandria is of the same basic meaning as the longer one, but omits some elements and does not coincide with it literally.[1] This is the only direct parallel between the two documents in question from what we know in the patristic sources; therefore, it is essential that one be very cautious in describing what may have been the relation between the two documents.

There is another parallel between the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Gospel of the Hebrews*. However, there are marked differences between the two passages, which raise the question of which is prior to the other and which may be dependent on the other, if at all. In his *Dialogue Against Pelagius* III. 2, Jerome quotes from the *Gospel of the Hebrews* a saying of Jesus supposed to have been uttered by Him when His mother and brothers approached Him about being baptized by John the Baptist. They requested that they all go and be baptized by John, to which Jesus replied, "'*Wherein (what) have I sinned*, that I should go and be baptized of him? unless peradventure this very thing that I have said is *a sin* of ignorance.'"[2] The first clause underlined above sounds very much like part of Saying 105 (what is underlined):

> They said [tọ Ḥim], "Come and let us pray today and fast." Jesus said, ["No]; for *what is the sin*

---

[1] *Stromateis* I. 9. 45: "'He that wondereth shall reign, and he that reigneth shall rest.'" Quoted in James, *ibid*.

[2] James, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

> which I have committed, or in what was I defeated? But whenever the bridegroom goes out of the bridal chamber, then let there be fasting and praying."

Jerome's quotation has to do with Jesus being baptized by John, whereas Saying 105 deals with fasting and prayer. Both indicate the sinlessness of Jesus. We cannot be sure what relationship there may be in this case. It is not even certain that the quotation in Jerome is prior to Saying 105. Apparently what Jerome knew as the Gospel of the Hebrews had been considerably altered by the time it reached him from what it had been at an earlier period.[1] Thus to maintain a literary connection at this point is more hazardous than with Saying 1. The common substance of Saying 105 and the parallel quoted from Jerome could as easily have been derived from a source used by both.

Quispel seeks to make much of the Jewish-Christian background of the Gospel of Thomas by recourse to Saying 11 which mentions "James the Just." He thinks it comes very close to the views of the Gospel of the Hebrews as represented in Jerome's quotation of it in his Of Illustrious Men 2.[2] Here

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 1-10, compare the different citations of the several church fathers from the Gospel of the Hebrews.

[2] Ibid., p. 4: "Also the Gospel called according to the Hebrews, lately translated by me into Greek and Latin speech, which Origen often uses, tells, after the resurrection of the Saviour: 'Now the Lord, when he had given the linen cloth unto the servant of the priest, went unto James and appeared to him (for James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour wherein he had drunk the Lord's cup until he should see him risen again from among them that sleep)', and again after a little, 'Bring ye, saith the Lord,

James is the first to whom the Risen Lord appeared; this is in line with the Jewish-Christian view "that James was the primate of Christianity . . . . So it is almost certain that this saying about James comes from the same source,"[1] says Quispel. One may also call to mind that the Pseudo-Clementine literature refers to James as having been ordained bishop of the Jerusalem church by the Lord himself,[2] and being "bishop of bishops, who rules Jerusalem, the holy church of the Hebrews, and the churches everywhere excellently founded by the providence of God . . . ."[3] But is James actually the center of attention in Saying 11 as is usually maintained? If the translation which I have given is correct, there is a shift of emphasis from James to "the place":

> The disciples said to Jesus, "We know that you will depart from us. What[4] (then) will be greater than we?" Jesus said to them, "The *place* whence you came, to which you are going to James the Just, on whose account heaven and earth came into being."

---

a table and bread', and immediately it is added, 'He took bread and blessed and brake and gave it unto James the Just and said unto him: My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from among them that sleep'."

[1] "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament," pp. 189, 190.

[2] *Clem. Rec*. I. 43.

[3] "Epistle of Clement to James," Salutation, in *Clem. Hom*.

[4] The Coptic word is NIM, "Who? which? what?" and is interchangeable with Aϣ, but usually indicates persons. Plumley, *op. cit*., par. 344. However, since Jesus' answer begins with ΠΜΑ, "the place," I have translated NIM as "what" because of the emphasis upon MA, not James.

Not James but "the place" whence the disciples originated and whence they are destined "will be greater" than they. The heavenly Jesus is speaking to the disciples about His departure from them. When He has entered "the place," (within God) where James also is, that place will be greater than the disciples. There is, therefore, nothing that would require that Saying 11 be derived from the Gospel of the Hebrews, and even if it is based on a Jewish-Christian tradition with regard to James, which is likely, James in Saying 11 is purely incidental to the central emphasis.

It may very well be that some of the material in the Gospel of Thomas has a Jewish-Christian literary background.[1] If so, however, it has been transposed into a new key. Some traditional sayings may have a Jewish-Christian or even an Ebionite background, but the perspective of the sayings as found in our collection is not Jewish-Christian. The features of Ebionite Christianity known through Epiphanius[2] and the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions[3] are not found in the

---

[1] No. 8, the seed falls "upon" not beside the road, Syriac Recognitiones III. 14. 7, Wilhelm Frankenberg, Die Syrischen Clementinen mit Griechischen Paralleltext, Vol. XLVIII of Texte und Untersuchungen (Leipzig: J. C. Heinrich's Verlag, 1937), p. 173, quoted in G. Quispel, "L'Evangile selon Thomas et les Clementines," Vigiliae Christianae, XII (December, 1958), 183. See also Saying 78, where the merchant who bought the pearl is described as "wise," parallel to Clem. Rec. (Latin) III. 62.

[2] Lagrange, op. cit.

[3] Roberts and Donaldson, op. cit., Vol. VIII.

Gospel of Thomas. On the contrary the Gospel of Thomas spiritualizes fasting, prayer, and almsgiving (Nos. 5, 13, 105), Sabbath observance (28), circumcision (55), and speaks disparagingly of the Old Testament (54), the Jews (44), and the Scribes and Pharisees (40, 103). It is anti-legalistic (23), rejects dietary laws (14), and has no trace of an Ebionite adoptionist Christology (15, 79, 106).[1]

The Gospel According to the Egyptians.--We know this apocryphal work through Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius. The basic emphasis of the passages in Clement of Alexandria has to do with sexual asceticism and the teaching that the kingdom is realized when sexual distinctions disappear. Clement reports in Stromateis III. 9. 63, this saying ascribed to Jesus: "'I came to destroy the works of the female,(meaning by 'female' desire, and by 'works' birth and corruption."[2] Hippolytus has a notice about the Naassene doctrine being set forth in the Gospel of the Egyptians,[3] and Epiphanius states that the Sabellians drew their teaching from the same book.[1] The quotations in Clement of Alexandria, however, are primary. Let us look first at Stromateis III. 13. 92:

---

[1] For a summary of Ebionite views see H. J. Schoeps, "Ebionite Christianity," trans. R. H. Lightfoot, Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, IV (October, 1953), 219-24.

[2] Trans. in Henry Chadwick and John E. L. Oulton (eds.), Alexandrian Christianity, Vol. II of The Library of Christian Classics, ed. John Baillie and others (26 vols.; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), p. 69. This passage bears a certain resemblance to the attitude of Clem. Hom. III. 27, where it is said, "The male is wholly truth, the female wholly falsehood."

[3] Ref. V. 2.

> When Salome asked when she would know the answer to her questions, the Lord said, When you trample on the robe of shame, and when the two shall be one, and the male with the female, and there is neither male nor female.[2]

We are reminded at once of Saying 38:

> His disciples said, "On what day will you be revealed to us and on what day shall we see you?" Jesus said, "Whenever you strip yourselves of your shame and take your garments and put them under your feet, like little children, and tread upon them, then [you shall be] sons of the Living One and shall not be afraid."

Not only do both these parallel sayings indicate transcendence of sexual differences, but they also indicate a strong tendency toward sexual asceticism. The verbal similarities are close enough to make possible some kind of literary relationship. The Gospel of Thomas could be dependent upon the Gospel of the Egyptians or else both are dependent on the same tradition. In Saying 23 there is a parallel to the "two shall be one . . . ." When asked about entering the kingdom, Jesus said to his disciples:

---

[1] Haer. LXII. 2.

[2] Chadwick and Oulton, op. cit., p. 83. II Clement 12:2 has this in a slightly different form: "For when someone asked the Lord when his Kingdom was going to come, he said, 'When the two shall be one, and the outside like the inside, and the male with the female, neither male nor female.'" Trans. in Cyril C. Richardson (ed.), Early Christian Fathers, Vol. I of The Library of Christian Classics, ed. John Baillie and others (26 vols.; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), p. 198.

> Whenever you make the two one, and whenever you make the inside like the outside and the outside like the inside, and the upper like the lower in order to make the male with the female into one only, so that the male may not be male and the female not be female . . . .

This seems to be an expansion of the passage in the Gospel of the Egyptians or else the latter is an abbreviation of Saying 23. All the above appear to belong to the same general pattern and may be related to what Hippolytus says of the Naassenes' view of the androgynous man who is "neither male or female, but a new creature, a new man . . . ."[1]

There are other sayings in the Gospel of Thomas which share with the Gospel of the Egyptians its sexual-ascetic views. Such are No. 10: "whenever you become two what shall you do?" which may refer to the disunity and lack of harmony which marriage brings;[2] No. 50: "If two make peace with each other in the same family (house) . . . "; and No. 63: "whenever one is desolate (celibate), he shall die in light, but whenever one is divided (by marriage), he shall die in darkness."[3] The affinities of the two documents are so close on the subject of sex as to make plain the fact that at this point the Gospel of Thomas moves in much the same frame of reference as Egyptians. Moreover, since both were current in Egypt at about the same time, it is possible that Sayings 38 and 23 at least were derived from the Gospel of the Egyptians. It would be more logical to conclude that the expanded form of the two sayings shows dependence upon the simpler forms found in Egyptians than that the reverse process applies. Both documents, however, may be dependent upon a common literary source.

---

[1] Ref. V. 2.

[2] Cf. I Cor. 7:34.

[3] Above, chap. i, p. 37.

Affinities with the Basilideans.--From his survey of the Chenoboskion library Doresse thinks that the doctrines of Basilides form the closest approximation of the basic tenets of the Chenoboskion community. He refers to Basilides as the one who had the most precise knowledge of the Iranian doctrine of primordial principles--the antithesis of light and darkness. It was Basilides who placed at the head of the created world Ialdabaoth and his son Sabaoth. Also, to Basilides and Isidore (his son) were attributed the speculations upon the "counterfeiting spirit"--the appended soul which keeps account of one's sins and brings charges against him when he faces the Archons.[1] All these doctrines are explicit in the documents from Chenoboskion and are basic to the community's perspective. Doresse adds a rather suggestive line[2] in which he refers to Origen's statement that Basilides wrote a Gospel in "his own name,"[1] and to Hippolytus' saying "that Matthias communicated to them [the Basilideans] secret discourses, which, being specially instructed, he heard from the Saviour."[2] This reminds us at once of the Gospel of Thomas and raises the question whether our collection or part of it had its origin from Basilides or his disciples.

---

[1] Doresse, op. cit., pp. 296, 297.

[2] Ibid., p. 296.

However, there is only one direct parallel that might establish a connection. In Saying 24 we find the following: Jesus said, "I will choose you, one out of a thousand and two out of ten thousand." Irenaeus mentions the opinions of the Basilideans who hold that "The multitude . . . cannot understand these matters, but only one out of a thousand, or two out of ten thousand."[3] This single verbal parallel is sufficient only for maintaining that Saying 24 may have come from the Basilideans[4] and not the entire collection. As for further echoes of Basilidean doctrines in the collection, there are none.[5]

---

[1] In Lucam, Hom. i. quoted in Selections from the Commentaries and Homilies of Origen, trans. R. B. Tollinton (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929), p. 104.

[2] Ref. VII. 8.

[3] Adv. Haer. I. 24. 6.

[4] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 83, point out that "Such a conclusion would not, of course, mean that Thomas was writing at a late date. We know that Basilides flourished in the reign of Hadrian (117-138). Thomas is not necessarily much later."

[5] R. M. Grant, "Notes on the Gospel of Thomas," Vigiliae Christianae, XIII (September, 1959), 171, 172, seeks to main-

Relation to the Naassenes.--The Naassene Gnostics are known through the writings of Hippolytus (born 160-170, died about 235 A.D.). Hippolytus was a famous Roman "anti-pope" during the "pontificate" of Kallistos (217-222 A.D.). Books V and VIII of his Refutationis omnium haeresium are our only sources of information on this sect. It is generally believed that the Naassenes came on the scene early in the second century A.D., though it is impossible to date the movement with any great degree of precision.[1] The group belongs in the

---

tain a connection between Saying 14 (against dietary laws) and Irenaeus Adv. Haer. I. 24. 5, where the latter refers to the Basilidean attitude toward meat offered to idols and "the use of other things." There is not a verbal parallel here, nor necessarily a conceptual one, and the comparison is too tenuous to be pressed. The same applies to Saying 83, which speaks of renouncing or denying power and which Grant connects with Adv. Haer. I. 24. 4. Here Irenaeus speaks of a docetic Christology held by the Basilideans, who taught that it was essential to deny "the crucified" if one was to be freed from "the power of those who formed our bodies," continuing, "He who denies him [the crucified one, whom they say was Simon of Cyrene and not Jesus] has been freed from these beings, and is acquainted with the dispensation of the unborn father." One must stretch his imagination to see any connection between Saying 83 and the Basilidean Christology. Perhaps we should point out here that there is a completely different summation of the system of Basilides in Hippolytus Ref. VII. 2-15, which is much more philosophical than the account given in Irenaeus. This constitutes a real problem on the genuine teaching of Basilides. It may be that Hippolytus' account represents the teachings of Basilides himself, while Irenaeus may have been giving the views of the later followers of Basilides. This could be true in spite of the fact that Hippolytus is later than Irenaeus.

[1] However, Eugene de Faye, Gnostiques et Gnosticisme (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1925), pp. 349-54, believes that the groups generally called ophitic are eclectic sects of the late second century.

general classification of the Ophites, of which there were several branches. The serpent (ὄφις) played some role in each of these groups, although in many instances it was only a religious symbol rather than an object of worship. These Gnostics probably came to use the serpent in their doctrinal formulations due to the widespread influence of the snake-symbol in the religions of the ancient Near East.[1] The name of the sect with which we are concerned is derived from the Hebrew nachash[2] (= serpent).

It is interesting that the serpent is called "a moist substance, just as Thales also, the Milesian, (spoke of water as an originating principle,) and that nothing of existing things, immortal or mortal, animate or inanimate, could exist at all without him."[3] From this point of view the serpent was looked upon as symbolic of the originating ground of being, the sole animating principle of all existent things, and thus stands for the highest Deity dispersed throughout the universe.[4] Hence, we are at this point in touch with a pantheistic theology.[5]

---

[1] Francis Legge, Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915), II, 49.

[2] Ref. V. 1.

[3] Ibid., V. 4.

[4] J. P. Steffes, Das Wesen des Gnostizismus und sein Verhaeltnis zum katholischen Dogma (Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schoeningh, 1922), pp. 189, 190.

[5] See below, chap. vi, p. 261.

The essential idea which the Naassenes held to was a cyclic view of the cosmos with a three-fold arrangement in the order of Being: (1) The highest realm is that of the originating cause and source of existence, the realm of the highest Divinity. (2) The next is an intermediate realm, which is derived from the highest order but remains essentially one with it. (3) The third is the realm of earthly existence in which particles from the first and second stages have become imprisoned in matter. This imprisonment constitutes the evil of existence, which can only be overcome by Gnosis of one's true nature and, presumably, by breaking the cycle of existence (which is preserved through death and rebirth) by means of sexual asceticism.[1] From the information given by Hippolytus, it is not exactly clear how the earthly order came into existence. However, mythologically speaking it is the result of the creative work of "Ialdabaoth, a fiery God, . . . the Demiurge and father of the formal world."[2] From the highest realm "souls have been conveyed down here into a creation of clay" in order to be the slaves of Ialdabaoth.[3]

This brings us to the theme which runs throughout the theology of the Naassenes; namely, Anthropos-speculation. The highest Divinity they called "the blessed man from above, or the primal man or Adam."[1] From him there issued, as a thought from the brain, the Son of Man who rules over the intermediate realm.[2] Seemingly there followed of necessity the creation of the earthly order of things, whether out of a preexistent material chaos or as the result of degenerating emanations from the Deity we cannot be sure. Moreover, the Great Man himself is of three parts, "rational, . . . psychical, . . . earthly."[3] When earth (= many powers!) brought forth man in the likeness of the Primal Man, he was still, lifeless, and inanimate. Then the Great Man imparted a soul to the image-man, and as a result man suffers punishment from the Man above. Soul, then, is seen as the animating principle of all things, as from another point of view the same is true of the serpent. Unfortunately, however, psyche is now imprisoned in matter; yet, it seeks to return to its place of origin, and consequently there is the upward striving to complete the cycle of existence. It should also be seen that the Great Man is bisexual in nature and being "neither female or male"[4] represents the highest unity of Being. Man here below, however, is divided into male and female. If the soul of man is to be restored to its original unitary existence in God, this distinction must be abolished. Man must return to his original integrity. The present dichotomy cannot be abolished so long as sexual relations continue, for by this means the fragmentation of soul continues and remains in the prison of the body. Therefore, the Naassenes taught that "the intercourse of woman with man is demonstrated . . . to be an exceedingly wicked and filthy (practice);"[1] it represents continued subservience to the material world.

---

[1] *Ref*. V. 2.

[2] *Ibid*.

[3] *Ibid*.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., and V. 3, 4.

[3] Ibid., V. 1.

[4] Ibid., V. 3.

The above is by no means an exhaustive analysis of Naassene theology, for according to Hippolytus the sect utilized various symbols and myths to express the same basic concepts.[2] Nevertheless, what has been mentioned is sufficient to form the background of the following discussion.

Hippolytus writes that the Naassenes had in their possession the *Gospel According to Thomas* which they quoted in support of their belief in the discovery of "the happy nature" or "the kingdom of heaven" which is to be found within man:

> And concerning this (nature) they hand down an explicit passage, occurring in the Gospel inscribed according to Thomas, expressing themselves thus: "He who seeks me, will find me in children from seven years old; for there concealed, I shall in the fourteenth age [αἰῶν] be made manifest."[3]

---

[1] *Ibid*., V. 2.

[2] See Leander Earl Keck, *The Sojourn of the Saviour, The Use of the Life of Jesus in Christian Gnosticism* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School of Yale University, 1957), pp. 98-106.

[3] *Ref*. V. 2.

We immediately recognize the parallel to Saying 3 of the Coptic Gospel of Thomas:

> Jesus said, "The man (who is) old in his days will not hesitate to ask a little child who is seven days old about the place of Life, and he shall live; for there are many first who shall be last, and they shall be one only."

The agreements between the two versions would indicate usage of at least some of the material to be found in the Gospel of Thomas. The parallel suggests one of two alternatives: (1) All or parts of the Gospel of Thomas as we know it existed prior to Naassene usage of it, and the citation of Hippolytus demonstrates a Naassene modification of Saying 3. (2) Saying 3 (and possibly other portions of the collection as we shall see) as we possess it was expurgated of the aeōn reference after it had passed through Naassene hands. The first possibility seems to be the more likely of the two.

Our next point of contact has to do with Naassene cosmology. Presumably the "three words" which Jesus spoke to Thomas in Saying 12 find their clarification in the Naassene tri-partite division of the universe. Again Hippolytus writes:

> These are the three tumid expressions (of these heretics), CAULACAU, SAULASAU, ZEESAR. CAULACAU, i. e., Adam, who is farthest above; SAULASAU, that is, the mortal one below; ZEESAR, that is, Jordan that flows upwards.[1]

---

[1] Ref. V. 3. cf. Isa. 28:10, in which part of the retort of the drunkards to the repeated admonitions of Isaiah is found. J. Skinner, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, in The Cambridge Bible, ed. A. F. Kirkpatrick (2nd. ed. rev.; Cambridge: The University Press, 1951 reprint), p. 223, says of v. 10: "The topers proceed to mock, in stammering drunken

The first (Caulacau) is the upper realm of the first Adam; the second (Saulasau) is the lowest, perishable realm below; the third (Zeesar) is the intermediate realm between the two, presided over by the Son of Man. "In the process of salvation the fallen souls are redeemed from degrading contact with earth and are raised to the middle sphere where they become one with the Son of Man . . . ."[1] The severe stricture on disclosing the "three words" in Saying 12 suggest such a special secret teaching of a cosmological nature; hence, there may be Naassene doctrine in the background that clarifies what the "three words" mean.

There is another interesting parallel with Saying 10.

---

tones, the excited utterance and the wearisome iterations of the prophet's teaching. For it is precept upon precept . . . line upon line . . . here a little, there a little] The Heb. as pointed is a series of broken monosyllables (ẓaw laẓaw ẓaw laẓaw ḳaw laḳaw ḳaw laḳaw zʿer sham zʿer sham); the sense is far from certain, but the tones sufficiently represent at once the disgust of the speakers with the restless persistency of their monitor and their own inability to express themselves distinctly. The EVV. connect ẓaw with the verb ẓiwah 'command' (so Vulg., but as Impve.), and take ḳaw in its usual sense of 'line.' LXX misread ẓaw as ẓar (θλῖψις), and derive ḳaw (with Vulg.) from the verb for 'hope.' It is just possible that ẓaw and ḳaw are mocking reproductions of the words for 'filth' (ẓeʾåh) and 'vomit (ḳi) in v. 8 (so Pesh.)." It is not difficult to see how the Gnostics would try to capitalize on obscure passages like this one, claiming a special secret revelation for themselves. The interpretation of Epiphanius Haer. XXV. is based upon the error of the LXX noticed above; see Roberts and Donaldson, op. cit., V, 52, note 10: "Saulasau is tribulation, Caulacau hope, and Zeesar 'hope, as yet little.'"

[1] R. P. Casey, "Naassenes and Ophites," Journal of Theological Studies, XXVII (1925-26), 381.

The passages are given in sequence (Saying 10 first) with the most significant sections underlined.

> Jesus said, "This heaven will pass away, and this heaven which is over it will pass away. And those who are dead do not live, and those who are alive do not die. *In the days when you were eating that which was dead, you were making it alive. Whenever you are in the light, what do you do?* Today you are one, you are both together. But whenever you become two, what shall you do?"
>
> λέγουσι γοῦν· *Εἰ νεκρὰ ἐφάγετε καὶ ζῶντα ἐποιήσατε, τί, ἀν ζῶντα φάγητε, ποιήσετε*; Ζῶντα δὲ λέγουσι καὶ λόγους καὶ νόας καὶ ἀνθρώπους, τοὺς μαργαρίτας ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀχαρακτηρίστου ἐῤῥιμμένους εἰς τὸ πλάσμα κάτω. τουτέστιν ὃ λέγει, φησί· Μὴ βάλητε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶ μηδὲ τοὺς μαργαρίτας τοῖς χοίροις.[1]

There is basic agreement only between the parts that are underlined. We should notice that the clauses in the *Gospel of Thomas* are temporal; in the Naassene version they are conditional. Saying 10 has a reference to "the light," which is not found in the Naassene version, and the former concludes with a veiled warning against becoming divided, possibly by marriage.[2] The Naassene version has an entirely different application, "the living" being described as "rational faculties and minds and men,--pearls of that unportrayable one cast into the plasma (?) below." Then follows the modified quotation from Mt. 7:6 about giving what is holy to the dogs and casting pearls before swine. We cannot be sure what connection there may be between Saying 10 and the Naassene version. Perhaps Hippolytus' sources represent a variant usage of a saying identical to the one found in our collection.

---

[1] *Ref*. V. 8.; *Pat. Gr*., XVI, col. 3149.

[2] See Saying 63, above, chap. 1.

There are certain doctrinal features of Naassene thought which seem to parallel some of the sayings in the Coptic collection. For example, the Naassene views on sexual abstinence may be reflected in Sayings 21 and 23, though a Naassene background is not necessary to explain them since they are closely related to the Gospel of the Egyptians.[1] Furthermore, the spiritualizing tendency of the Gospel of Thomas with regard to fasting, prayer, alms-giving (Nos. 5, 13, 105), Sabbath observance (28), and circumcision (55) may be a reflection of the Naassene conception that "'the adoration of the perfect ones [Gnostics] . . . is spiritual, not carnal.'"[2]

Saying 87 deals with Adam who "came to be out of a great power" and seems to be related to the Naassene doctrine of man.[3] We have already mentioned the Naassene conception of the creation of the first earthly man, whose bodily form was fashioned from earth by "many powers," but whose psyche was given to him by the Great Man who is above.[1]

---

[1] Ref. V. 2. See above discussion under The Gospel According to the Egyptians.

[2] Ibid., V. 4.

[3] Ibid., V. 2.

Still further, the Naassenes emphasized that the Son of Man was produced from Man; He did not come from woman, as those who are "ignorant of the Son" believe.[2] It is true that the three qualities (the rational, the psychical, and the earthly) of the Great Man descended upon Jesus who was born of Mary,[3] but this Jesus was not himself the Son of Man. The historical Jesus could not be the heavenly Son of Man who issued from the androgynous Primal Man. This concept is very much like what we find in Saying 15: Jesus said, "Whenever you see Him who was not born of woman, fall upon your face and worship him. That one (is) your Father." If we are to accept the Naassene doctrine as lying behind this saying, then its meaning is clear. The Jesus of Thomas may thus be teaching of Himself that He is the heavenly Son of Man and is not to be thought of as one "born of woman" and "of the seed of David,"[4] like the earthly, historical Jesus.

Finally, the Naassene interpretation of the Parable of the Mustard Seed and the Parable of the Sower may offer a clue to the way in which Sayings 20 and 8 (respectively) were intended to be interpreted. Of the Mustard Seek the Naassenes identified it with an indivisible point within man (which is equivalent to the kingdom of heaven and the true self) which

---

[1] See above, p. 115.

[2] Ref. VIII. 6. Casey, op. cit., pp. 374-87, has shown that Monoïmus the Arabian, whose teaching is described in Bk. VIII by Hippolytus, was a Naassene.

[3] Ref. V. 1.

[4] Ro. 1:3.

> will become through its own reflective power a certain incomprehensible magnitude. This . . . is the kingdom of heaven, the grain of mustard seed, the point which is indivisible in the body; and . . . no one knows this (point) save the spiritual only.[1]

It is the object of the Gnostic to know this "point," the true self within. As for the Parable of the Sower, to the Naassenes it meant simply that "none becomes a hearer of these mysteries [Naassene teachings], unless only the perfect Gnostics."[2] While another interpretation may be possible, it is reasonable to assume that the parable was intended to mean the same thing in the Gospel of Thomas.

It is obvious that some relation exists between the Gospel of Thomas and the Naassene Gnostics; yet, the absence of close textual or verbal parallels between the citations given by Hippolytus and the corresponding passages in the Gospel of Thomas prevent an accurate definition of the relationship. If the Naassenes held such bizarre notions as Hippolytus ascribed to them, and if they used and possibly revised the Gospel of Thomas, why is it that their teachings are not more explicit in our collection? Since the collection may have been intended for initiates and prospective initiates alike, one answer could be that its teachings were made purposefully vague with the full meaning not to be made known except by oral instruction. It is also conceivable that the Gospel of Thomas as we know it has come from a sect related to the Naassenes but possibly prior to them and also somewhat less heretical. The second alternative seems to be the better and more logical of the two.

---

[1] Ref. v. 4.

[2] Ibid., V. 3.

Comparison with Poimandres.--No study of this type would be complete without taking into account the Hermetic tractate Poimandres, one of the most important non-Christian Gnostic writings. The probable early date of Poimandres[1] would not rule out direct influence upon the Gospel of Thomas, but it is not necessary to assume this. If there is to be found any relation whatever, it could have occurred through some intermediate agency.

---

[1] C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), pp. 206-209, argues that it comes from the early second or late first century A.D. He points out the generally recognized relationship between Poimandres and the system of Valentinus and concludes that the simpler nature of the Hermetic treatise leads one to believe it to be the precursor of the more developed Valentinian Gnosis. Dodd remarks that it is conceivable that a disciple of Valentinus may have pared down an elaborate system into the form of Poimandres, but the reverse process from the simple to the complex is more likely. Since, according to Dodd, Valentinus is dated c. 130-140 A.D., Poimandres probably falls before this period. However, there is more recent evidence which changes somewhat our understanding of Valentinianism in its early stages. Professor Kendrick Grobel (trans.), The Gospel of Truth, A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), pp. 11-29, has shown that Valentinus himself held to a less developed body of doctrine, at least at an early stage in his career. If this is so, it is not necessary to assume an extremely early date for Poimandres. It may even have been contemporaneous with Valentinus. Since

It may be that Saying 22 (on self-knowledge) may have some relation to Naassene thought, but a more interesting and illuminating parallel to the latter portion of Saying 2 is found in Poimandres.

Saying 2	Poim. 19:14-17
Whenever you know	καὶ ὁ ἀναγνωρίσας
yourselves, then you	ἑαυτὸν
will be known, and you	
will understand that you	
are the sons of the	ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸ περι-
living Father.	ούσιον ἀγαθόν,

---

it is impossible to determine the rate of development of Gnostic speculations, one must be cautious in insisting upon an extraordinary time-span for such developments. The evidence for the study of Gnosticism indicates that simple and complex systems existed side by side in point of time. Nevertheless, Eugene de Faye, op. cit., pp. 469-83, affirms an evolutionary process in the unfolding of various Gnostic systems consisting basically of three rather sharply defined stages: (1) A pre-Gnostic stage, roughly contemporaneous with the beginnings of Christianity, when unassimilated and unsystematized ideas were prevalent; (2) The creative era of the great Gnostic system-makers such as Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion, beginning from about 120 A.D.; (3) The stage of popularization of the Gnostic systems for the benefit of the masses, occurring from the second half of the second century on. This final state saw extensive mixing and borrowing between the various schools, with an ever increasing sacramentalism and ritualism as the means of salvation and an unparalleled elaboration of the super-mundane hierarchy of beings.

But if you do not know	ὁ δὲ ἀγαπήσας τὸ ἐκ
yourselves, then you	πλάνης ἔρωτος σῶμα,
are in poverty and you	οὗτος μένει ἐν τῷ
are poverty.	σκότει πλανώμενος,
	αἰσθητῶς πάσχων τὰ
	τοῦ θανάτου.[1]

Saying 2 does not have any reference to sexual passion as a manifestation of involvement in evil matter as does Poimandres 19, but the "being-in-poverty" of Saying 2 may easily lend itself to a similar interpretation. The low estimation of "flesh" and "body" (Sayings 30, 89, 113) suggest that the "being-in-poverty" included involvement in the delusion, suffering, and darkness of the sense-world. The total impression of the Gospel of Thomas with regard to sex and the attitude toward absorption in matter leads to the observation that the perspectives of Poimandres and Thomas are quite similar. Both agree in their emphasis upon self-knowledge as the means of attaining the supreme good, but this is a characteristic that Thomas would hold in common with any Gnostic treatise. In Saying 2 self-knowledge is defined as knowledge of "the kingdom of heaven." In Poimandres it is a case of recognizing the "Logos" and the "Nous" within oneself which are identical with the absolute "Logos" and "Nous"[1] through the participation of men in the nature of the fallen divine Man.[2] Perhaps the more "philosophical" definition of self-knowledge in Poimandres has been changed to conform to the Naassene conception of the kingdom in Saying 2. However, what we have here may be nothing more than a similarity of ideas, the basic import being the necessity of self-knowledge, a common feature in Gnostic thought. Self-knowledge is necessary since there resides within the self that which is derived from the divine and is essentially one with it, and since release from the material sense-world depends upon one having his "ignorance" of his true estate banished by the enlightenment which this knowledge brings.

---

[1] A. D. Nock (ed.) and A. J. Festugiere (trans.), Corpus Hermeticum (Paris: Societe d'Edition "Les Belles Lettres," 1945), I, 13. Our translation of the Greek passage given above follows: "And he who has come to the knowledge of (recognized) himself, has entered into the super-essential (?) good, but he who has cherished the body which comes out of the error of sexual passion continues wandering in darkness, suffering in the senses the things of death."

---

[1] Ibid., par. 6, pp. 8, 19. cf. note 16, p. 18, by Nock: "Noûs et Logos divins existant à la fois et dans le monde archétype et dans chacun de nous, et comportant les mêmes relations dans les deux cas, on explique les rapports de filiation de Logos à Noûs en Dieu par la dépendance du Logos à l'égard de l'Intellect en nous."

[2] In the system of the Hermetic treatise, the original divine Nous, by self-generation, begot in order three divine sons, Logos, Demiurge, and Anthropos or Man. Man was made in the image of God. Looking downward at the lower Nature (the material world, which seems to have been ultimately derived from the supreme God and was not an independent principle), Man beheld the reflection of His form in Nature and Nature also beheld the beautiful form of God in Him. Seeing His likeness reflected in Náture, Man desired to dwell in it. Immediately in mutual love the two mingled together. "And this is why alone of all the animals on earth man is twofold, mortal through the body, immortal through the essential Man." Poim. 15. trans. in Hans Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), p. 151. From this union Nature produced seven androgynous men, and later these were separated into male and female.

The only other similarity to Poimandres is found in the use of the symbol of "drunkenness" to describe the state of ignorance. This symbol is used in Saying 29 and in Poimandres 27.[1] Aside from this, there is little else to connect the two documents except the common element of grief "over the sons of men" on the part of the revealer (This is only implied in Poimandres.).

Thus a comparison of the two documents yields very little of value except possibly two faint echoes of the Hermetic tractate in the Gospel of Thomas. According to Doresse no fewer than five Hermetic documents are present in the Chenoboskion library (Documents No. 21, 22, 23, 25, 26), of which the unnamed treatise No. 23 recalls certain passages of Poimandres.[2] This indicates the significance that the Chenoboskion community attached to such literature, but the Gospel of Thomas seems to have been scarcely affected by the use of the Hermetic documents.

---

[1] I translate par. 27 of Poimandres, Nock and Festugiere, op. cit., I, 16, as follows: "Having spoken these things to me, Poimandres was mingled with the Powers. And when I had given thanks and praised the Father of all things, I was dismissed by him (Poimandres), having been empowered and taught the nature of the All and the supreme vision. And I have begun to proclaim to men the beauty of godliness and knowledge: 'O people, earth-born men, who have given yourselves to drunkenness and sleep and a-gnosis of God, be sober (live soberly), and cease living in debauchery, you who are enchanted by irrational sleep.'"

[2] Doresse, op. cit., pp. 256-263.

The Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Truth.--Prior to the discovery of the Coptic library from Chenoboskion, the Gospel of Truth was known only by a reference in the writings of Irenaeus.[1] Nothing was recorded by Irenaeus of the essential nature of the Gospel of Truth except that he believed it to be a composition of the followers of Valentinus and that it did not agree with the canonical Gospels, which to Irenaeus were alone valid and apostolic. From the Coptic translation of this important work which is now accessible to the public in the excellent edition previously mentioned,[2] we learn that the title Gospel of Truth is, properly speaking, a misnomer. The title was undoubtedly assigned to the work as a whole from the opening words, "The Gospel of Truth is a joy for them who have received the boon, through the Father of Truth, of knowing it . . . ."[3] The words "Gospel of Truth" were not intended to be taken as an official title. Here "Gospel" is a conceptual, not a literary, term, and it means "the good news which Christ brought and is."[4] Hence, the Gospel of Truth is a kind of meditation on the meaning of the "good news." It is somewhat poetic in nature and in many instances is a powerfully moving expression of the author's faith.[1] It contains no narrative and no sayings of Jesus, although some of the latter are alluded to, and there are numerous reflections of the canonical books of the New Testament.

---

[1] Adv. Haer. III. 11. 9.

[2] Evangelium Veritatis; see above, p. 2.

[3] Grobel, op. cit., p. 32.

[4] Ibid., p. 33.

In terms of form and structure the Gospel of Thomas is quite different from the Gospel of Truth. The first is a collection of sayings with little apparent order; the second is a well organized religio-philosophical treatise often most abstruse and complex. While the Gospel of Truth represents Vaentinian mythological conceptions in an early stage, the Gospel of Thomas lacks a mythical framework, or perhaps better stated, such a framework is but vaguely implied. Lest these remarks be misleading, we must hasten to add that in some ways the Gospel of Truth is closer to orthodox Christian theology than Thomas. There are important parallels between these two works which bear discussing.[2]

One first notices that both works describe the state of the a-gnostic man as like unto "drunkenness."[3] As seen above, this is also a feature of Poimandres and seems to have been a favorite symbol of the Gnostics to describe the perilous condition of ignorance.[1]

---

[1] W. C. van Unnik, in Cross, op. cit., believes Valentinus himself to be the author of this work, as does Grobel, op. cit., pp. 26,27.

[2] All quotations from the Gospel of Truth are given by pages and lines (e.g., 22:16 = p. 22, line 16) and are taken from the excellent translation-commentary by Kendrick Grobel, op. cit.

[3] Gospel of Truth 22:16-20, ibid., p. 78; Gospel of Thomas, Saying 29.

Most significant are the passages which show agreement in certain distinctive ideas. The passages given below demonstrate some features which cannot be overlooked. In the case of the Gospel of Thomas, we touch upon what seems to be pantheism, while the same cannot be said of the parallel in the Gospel of Truth. The "Totality" (Coptic ΠΤΗΡϤ) in the Gospel of Truth probably includes all living creatures, both human and divine; "Totality" in the Gospel of Thomas may indicate the same thing, while the last portion of No. 79 ("Split the wood . . .") indicates the presence of the deity everywhere.[2]

G. of Tr. 17:4-8	G. of Th. 79
For indeed the Totality (of creatures) have been searching after that (or Him) from which they emerged--and (all along)	I am the light which is above them all. I am the Totality out of whom the Totality came forth
the Totality were within Him, the unthinkably Incomprehensible One, who is choicer than any thought![3]	and to whom the Totality has reached.
	Split the wood, (and) I am there; lift the stone, and you will find me there.

---

[1] Hans Jonas, Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist (2. Auflage; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954), I, 115-118.

[2] If this is consistent with such Sayings as 58, 82, 89, 111, and 113, then God is not to be identified with gross matter; yet, there is no place where He is not.

[3] Grobel, op. cit., pp. 38, 40.

In the Gospel of Truth the Totality (of creatures) were within the Father ("the unthinkably Incomprehensible One"); they emerged from Him, and they search after Him. In Saying 79, Jesus is made to identify himself as the transcendent but immanent Deity. Here He is the origin of the Totality (the universe?), which came from Him and has attained to or reached Him. There is no place where He is not. The identity of the One who is beyond yet inclusive of the Totality is the Father both in the Gospel of Truth, and in the Gospel of Thomas, for in the latter work Jesus is the Father![1] Yet, there is this difference; namely, that in the Gospel of Truth Jesus is not identified with the Father.

Another point of contact lies in the use of "rest" and "resting place" as symbols of redemption in both works. In the Gospel of Truth 24:9-20 the Father reveals Himself that "Rest" might be found "there in Him."[2] He is Himself the "resting place." In Saying 52 Jesus instructs His disciples to the effect that "the sign" of their Father in them is "a movement and a rest." Immediately following in Saying 53, the disciples inquire about the time when "the resting place of the dead ones" is to appear, to which Jesus replies, "That which you await has come, but you are not aware of it." Here the emphasis is upon the fact that the eschaton has already arrived, perhaps in Jesus' own person as the teacher of wise sayings, and the trouble with me is their ignorance, which keeps them from the salvation which "knowledge" brings.

---

[1] Saying 15.

[2] Grobel, op. cit., pp. 92, 94.

Similar also is the teaching upon "being" and "not-being." In the Gospel of Truth 27:26-33, the a-gnostics are described as ones "who have not yet become,"[1] since they have not come into the possession of the knowledge concerning who they are. The Gospel of Thomas also stresses the necessity of "becoming"[2] by means of self-recognition.[3] In Thomas one may "be," but he must "bring forth" or "acquire" (?) that One who is within him if he is to be removed from a condition of "being-in-poverty."[4] It is interesting in this same connection that both works refer often to God as "Father" and His own as "sons of the Father." In the Gospel of Truth it is explicitly stated that such "are from Him" (the Father),[5] while in Saying 52 "the sons" are derived "out of the light," which probably means the same thing as the Gospel of Truth.

The rather enigmatic reference to the "beginning and the end" in Saying 18 may be compared to Gospel of Truth 37:34-38:6.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 112.

[2] Saying 43: "Become while you pass through."

[3] Saying 2: "Whenever you know yourselves . . . ."

[4] Ibid. and Saying 73.

[5] Grobel, op. cit., p. 146.

G. of Tr. 37:34-38:6	Saying 18
For the Father knows the beginning of them all and their end. For at their end He will ask (?) them What about themselves? But the (true) End is the taking Gnosis concerning Him who is hidden . . . . Him from whom the beginning went forth, Him to whom all (they) shall return who came out of Him and became manifest to the glory and joy of His Name.[1]	The disciples said to Jesus, "Tell us in what manner our end will occur." Jesus said, "You indeed revealed the beginning in order that you might seek after the end, for in the place where the beginning was (?), there the end will be. Blessed is he who has stood in the beginning, and he shall know the end and shall not taste death.

In the Gospel of Truth the Father is cognizant of the condition of all men. When the last judgment ("their end") comes--apparently the allusion is such--He will confront them with the critical question "What about themselves?" The (true) "End" (goal) of the Gnostic (not of all men, but only of those who become Gnostic) "is described as knowing the one true God."[2] All men came from God, but only those shall return who receive the salvation He offers them. In Saying 18 there is also a play on "beginning and end." The disciples are concerned about the manner of their "end." Does this mean the last judgment as in the Gospel of Truth or death or the coming of the kingdom age? Grant and Freedman take it in the last sense,[3] which may be correct, although it is possible that the disciples are asking about death and Jesus takes this as an opportunity to teach concerning the "beginning and the end." Apparently the "beginning" and the "end" are ontologically the same; hence, the last part of Saying 18 either refers to the pre-existence of souls or vaguely recollects the self-identification of Jesus in Rev. 21:6 as "the Alpha and the Omega."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 176, 178, 180.

[2] Ibid., not 547, p. 179.

[3] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 138.

There are considerable differences between these two works, but there is agreement in the use of various terms and concepts which does not appear to be purely accidental. No direct literary relationship can be demonstrated; yet, the similarities are such that both may be dependent upon the same traditions or may represent parallel, though separate, developments of the same ideas.[2] It may be that the points of contact between the two documents are the result of an interchange among different sects.

The Gospel of Thomas and the Pistis Sophia.--The so-called Pistis Sophia is a bizarre theosophical composition, probably coming originally from the third century A.D.[3] Its fantastic schema represents what we may call Gnosticism "going to seed." The similarities between it and our collection are of no significance insofar as the origin of the Gospel of Thomas is concerned, but the demonstrable parallels serve to highlight some of the Gnostic characteristics of Thomas and aid in interpreting some of the sayings.

---

[1] Ibid.: "The one who stands (in the beginning, one with Jesus, and knows the end) will not taste death . . . ."

[2] A much more detailed study is needed at this point.

[3] Pistis Sophia, A Gnostic Miscellany, pp. xxix-xxxi.

We first mention the fact that both works have a reference to the "five trees." In Saying 19, there are "five trees in Paradise," and here Jesus says that if the disciples will know these trees, they "shall not taste death." In the Pistis Sophia there are "five trees" in the "treasury of light,"[1] though their meaning is not obvious.[2] In Saying 19

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 2, 162.

[2] W. E. Crum, "Coptic Anecdota," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV (1943) 177, translates a Gnostic fragment of the fourth or fifth century which mentions the "five trees," but due to its limited nature the fragment cannot be assigned to a particular sect. In Jean Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, trans. Philip Mairet (London: Hollis and Carter, 1960), p. 80, note 23, we find the following comment on the "five trees": "The symbolic meaning of the 'Trees' . . . is pretty variable. We saw the trees of Paradise likened by Justin to angels [above, p. 34]. The Psalms of Solomon treat them as saints (cf. above, note 86, p. 34); the Manichaean Kephalaion VI gives us five 'trees,' but these belong to the world of darkness (cf. H. C. Puech, 'Le Prince des Tenebres' . . . , in the volume of Etudes carmelitaines devoted to Satan, 1948, p. 151). Just as, in Manichaeism, the five trees of Darkness represent emanations of the Tree of Death, the five trees of light in our Gnostic treatise [Bruce Codex] may stand for abstract emanations of the Tree of Life. For example--as is doubtless the case with the 'Voices' the 'Amens' and other entities of that kind--the sources of the seals, the sacraments by which the Perfect attain to the Treasury of the Light.

"These metaphorical trees were originally borrowed from the Gospel Matt. VII, 17-19 and XII, 33; Luke VI, 43-4), and they make use also of the fact that the Greek hyle (matter) has also the primary meaning of 'wood.' Cf. in Puech, Le Manicheisme, note 285 on pp. 159-61. For the survival of the symbolism of the Trees of Life and of Death, see e. g., a the interpretation most likely is to be given in terms of Rev. 2:7; 22:2, 14, where the "tree of life" is mentioned, for if one "knows" the "five trees," "he shall not taste death." We do not know when this symbol originated nor why they were five in number. As seen in the Manichaean Psalm-Book, the number 5 appears to have a special significance in Gnostic thought.[1] According to Grant and Freedman, it stands for the five spiritual senses of the Gnostic.[2] The ambiguity of Rev. 22:2 (καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ξύλον ζωῆς) may have stimulated speculation on there being more than one "tree of life" in Paradise.

Another point of contact is the doctrine of the transmigration of souls in Pistis Sophia[3] and what is not far from such a doctrine in the Gospel of Thomas. If Sayings 18 and 19 do not indicate the pre-existence of Jesus, they must be taken to mean the pre-existence of the Gnostic man. The first alternative seems more likely. Turning to Saying 86 we find the clause "your images which were before you." Obviously the Greek notion of the pre-existence of souls is intended. It is only a short

---

double page in a manuscript of the Liber Floridus of Lambert de Saint Omer dating from before A.D. 1120, which displays, face to face, pictures of the Tree of Good and the Tree of Evil--reduced, it is true, to the simple moral signification (cf. the reproduction given on p. 159 of A. Grabar and Carl Nordenfalk, La peinture romane, Skira, Geneva, 1958)."

[1] R. C. Allberry (ed.), A Manichaean Psalm-Book (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), II, 160.

[2] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 139.

[3] Pistis Sophia, A Gnostic Miscellany, pp. 254, 255.

step from this view to that of transmigration, which is found in Pistis Sophia.[1]

The same personalities who appear in the Gospel of Thomas (Peter, Matthew, Thomas, James, Salome, Mary) are prominent in the Pistis Sophia as well.[2] This does not prove anything, but merely demonstrates one of the common characteristics of Gnostic literature. There is a tendency in various Gnostic works to utilize persons about whom very little is known from the canonical books of the New Testament. This serves the purpose of authenticating the assertion that the Gnostics have come into the possession of secret revelations delivered by Jesus to disciples such as Thomas, Philip, and James, and to women such as Salome and Mary. There is an interesting parallel to Saying 115 in Pistis Sophia II. 160b-161, where Peter rebukes Mary and women in general. In the Pistis Sophia passage Mary wishes to come forward with the solution of the words previously spoken by Jesus but says, "'My Lord . . . I am afraid of Peter, because he threatened me and hateth our sex.'"[3] Jesus then encourages her and says that no one can forbid her because she is "'filled with the spirit of light.'"[1] The superiority of male over female is indicated in both documents, though ultimately sex differentiation is completely transcended.

---

[1] The doctrine is, of course, not peculiar to Pistis Sophia. It is found among the disciples of Simon Magus and of Basilides, and among the Carpocratians and the Manichaeans. See Irenaeus Adv. Haer. I. 25. 4, and Doresse, Les livres secret . . ., pp. 118, 132.

[2] Pistis Sophia, A Gnostic Miscellany, pp. 58, 81, 135.

[3] Ibid., p. 135.

Two final parallels must be mentioned. The first is in connection with Saying 24: "I will choose you, one out of a thousand and two out of ten thousand . . . ." In Pistis Sophia Jesus is made to say, "'They will find one in a thousand and two in ten-thousand for the accomplishment of the mystery of the First Mystery.'"[2] We have already seen that this saying was current among the Basilideans;[3] thus, the Pistis Sophia does not necessarily depend upon the Gospel of Thomas but perhaps upon a tradition common to both. The final passage of importance involves the notion of Jesus becoming one with or being identified with those who learn from him. Saying 109 sets forth the idea that the man who learns from Jesus becomes like Him, and Jesus "shall become he" (lit.). The same view is found in several places in the Pistis Sophia, where Jesus speaks of the man who will "receive the mystery of the Ineffable" as "'That man is I and I am that man.'"[4] This sounds like a merging of two distinct selves into one or a mystic union of the Gnostic with Jesus.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 292.

[3] See above, p. 111.

[4] Pistis Sophia, A Gnostic Miscellany, pp. 191-93.

Manichaean Connections and Place of Origin.--Cyril of Jerusalem (348 A.D.) referred to the Gospel of Thomas as a Manichaean production.[1] We know that it is older than the Manichaeans,[2] and although they did not produce it, we can establish with certainty that they made use of it.

Let us look first at a single passage which demonstrates a very close literary connection. Puech has shown that Saying 17 is reproduced in the Manichaean Turfan-texts:[3]

> Eine genau Parallele findet sich in manichaeischen Turfan-Fragment M 789 . . . : "Ich will geben euch, was ihr mit dem Auge nicht gesehen, den Ohren nicht gehoert und nicht ergriffen mit der Hand."[4]

If this exact quotation is not enough to convince one that the Manichaeans made use of the Gospel of Thomas, certainly in conjunction with the statement of Cyril of Jerusalem and other parallels it shows beyond any doubt that the Manichaeans used the collection.

---

[1] Catech. VI. 31. : "'Let no one read the Gospel according to Thomas, for it is not by one of the twelve apostles, but by one of the three wicked disciples of Manes.'" Quoted in James, op. cit., p. 15.

[2] Mani was born in Persia, c. 215 or 216, and was crucified in 276 or 277. Manichaeism's period of greatest expansion was in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.

[3] The Turfan-texts are fragments of Manichaean literature in Persian and Turkish. They were found "at the oasis of Turfan in Chinese Turkestan at the beginning of this century . . . . These documents . . . are evidence of the flowering of a gnostic religion so far away as central Asia." Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 41. See also A. V. Williams Jackson, Researches in Manichaeism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932).

[4] H.-Ch. Puech, "Das Thomas-Evangelium," in Hennecke, op. cit., p. 217.

In one of the Manichaean psalms there is an almost exact duplication of one phrase from Saying 2.

Man. Psalm 160:21, 22	Saying 2 (80:25, 26)
ΤΜΝ̄ΤΡ̄ΡΟ Ν̄Μ̄ΠΗΥΕ ΕΙΣΤΕ Μ̄ΠΝ̄ϩ[ΟΥ]Ν ΕΙΣΤΕ Μ̄Π[Ν̄] Β[ΑΛ][1]	ΤΜΝ̄ΤΕΡΟ ΣΜ̄ΠΕΤΝ̄ϩΟΥΝ ΑΥΩ ΣΜ̄ΠΕΤΝ̄- ΒΑΛ
The kingdom of heaven--behold (it is) in our int[er]ior, behold, (it is) in ou[r] ex[terior]	The kingdom (is) in your interior and in your exterior

The "five trees" of Saying 19 occur in a similar passage in a Manichaean psalm, which may be partially reconstructed by using the Gospel of Thomas.

Man. Psalm 161:17-18	Saying 19 (84:21-22)
[ϯΟΥ] ΓΑΡ Ν̄ϣΗΝ ΝΕ̣Τ̣ϩΝ̄ΠΠΑΡΑΔΙΣ[ΟΣ ΝΕΤΕΜΕΡΕ] [ϩΩϭ]Μ̣Ε ϩΝ̄ΠϣΩΜ ΑΥΩ Μ̄Ν̄ΠΡΩ[2]	ΟΥΝ̄ΤΗΤΝ̄ ΓΑΡ Μ̄ΜΑΥ Ν̄ϯΟΥ Ν̄ϣΗΝ ϩΜ̄ ΠΑΡΑ ΔΙΣΟΣ ΕΣΕΚΙΜ ΑΝ Ν̄ϣΩΝ Μ̄ΠΡΩ ΑΥΩ ΜΑΡΕΝΟΥϭΩΒΕ ϩΕ ΕΒΟΛ
For [five] (are the trees in Paradi[se; ones which are	For you have five trees in Paradise; they are not

---

[1] Allberry, loc. cit.,

[2] Ibid. The reconstruction was communicated to me by Professor Kendrick Grobel, in a personal letter of February 2, 1960.

not wont] [to with]er in summer and winter.	shaken summer (and) winter, and their leaves are not wont to fall.

When we add to the above those parallels that are found in the Apocryphal Acts (especially the *Acts of Thomas*) which were used by the Manichaeans, then we are able to see how large a place the *Gospel of Thomas* occupied among them.[1]

Some scholars[2] affirm that one of the most important pieces of evidence with relation to the Manichaeans, however, has to do with the combination name Didymus-Judas-Thomas, which is found in the Preface of the *Gospel of Thomas*. It is important that the same designation is made of the apostle Thomas in the *Acts of Thomas*: "According to the lot, therefore, India fell unto Judas Thomas, which is also the twin . . . ."[3] At a later point in the same work Thomas is referred to as the "twin of Christ."[4] In the lists of the twelve disciples in the Synoptic Gospels, Thomas is known only by name,[5] but he assumes a more significant role in the Fourth Gospel. There he is mentioned seven times.[6] When he is introduced in the narrative, he is always designated Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος (with one exception at 14:5). This is but the evangelist's way of translating the meaning of the Aramaic name Thomas, which means "twin." Of these facts Grant and Freedman write:

---

[1] Cf. Saying 1 with *Acts of Thomas* 11. 136; Saying 12 with *Acts of Thomas* 5. 47b; Saying 23 with *Acts of Thomas* 12. 147, *Acts of Peter* 38, *Acts of Philip* 140, in James, *op. cit.*, pp. 424, 387, 429, 335, 450.

[2] Grant and Freedman, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

[3] Act 1. 1, in James, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

[4] Act 4. 39, *ibid.*, p. 383.

[5] Mt. 10:3; Mk. 3:18; Lk. 6:15.

[6] Jn. 11:16; 14:5; 20:24, 26, 27, 28; 21:2.

> Oriental writers and Westerners using Oriental documents identify Judas with Thomas and thus speak either of Judas Thomas or of Judas Didymus. Only two documents, apart from our Gospel of Thomas, use the full name Judas Thomas Didymus or speak of Judas Thomas as the twin--of Jesus! The first form is found in the apocryphal acts of Thomas, written in Syria or perhaps at Edessa in the second or third century; the second occurs in the Book of Thomas the Athlete,[1] part of the Nag Hammadi collection. Puech and Doresse have rightly argued that this form of the name suggests that the Gospel of Thomas originated in, or near, Syria.[2]

It is, of course, important to know the place of origin of the collection. Assuming that the above line of reasoning is correct and that the collection originated in Syria would strengthen the arguments of Quispel for a Semitic background to some of the sayings in the collection.[3] Yet, one must not expect too much from this line of reasoning. Even if the Gospel of Thomas is dependent upon a Semitic tradition of some sort, this does not automatically prove that it bears witness to a sayings-tradition as ancient as, or at some points older than, our canonical gospels. The analysis in the following chapter will clarify the issue still further.

---

[1] This statement is inaccurate, for both forms of the name occur in the Acts of Thomas quoted above.

[2] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 67.

[3] See above, p. 101, note 5, under The Gospel Acc. to the Hebrews.

Summary and Conclusion

We shall now briefly retrace our steps and summarize our findings. While we noticed an occasional catch-word sequence, we found nothing else of importance structurally speaking. Thomas seems to have been put together without regard to form in order to make the sayings intentionally obscure. We also observed that it is useless to seek for literary precedents as a means of aiding us in understanding the sayings. More significant is the fact that the document served as an instrument of religious instruction within the community upon the saving truth revealed by the heavenly Jesus.

We also found some points of contact with Jewish-Christian literature, but we cannot say thereby that the Gospel of Thomas, at least in its present form, came into existence in a Jewish-Christian community. It transcends and modifies completely whatever Jewish elements are to be found in the sayings.

Perhaps the most important thing of all has been the demonstration of positive similarities to Gnostic theology in general and Naassene views in particular. With regard to Naassene conceptions, the Gospel of Thomas seems to reflect the basic world view of the Naassenes, as well as showing some relationship to this group's teachings on sex, Jewish institutional observances, Christological formulations, and the interiorization and dehistoricization of the kingdom concept. We then found some conceptual parallels with Poimandres, a pagan Gnostic treatise. These similarities prove that Thomas shares in the general attitude of Gnosticism on such matters as the essential spiritual nature of man, the evil nature of matter, the peril of sex-involvement, and the tragedy of existence in the suffering and darkness of the sense-world. We also observed several striking parallels with the Gospel of Truth. Both works use such terms as "Father," "Totality," "drunkenness," "beginning and end," "place," and "rest." There is also a similarity in the description of illusory existence or the state of not-being and in the suggestion of emanations proceeding from and returning to the highest Godhead. A study of the Pistis Sophia has sharpened our awareness of the implications of Thomas that the ultimate end of the Gnostic is mystic union with God. Finally, the use of Thomas by the Manichaeans demonstrates the collection's adaptability to use in a full-blown Gnostic religious system. It also shows the place of origin of the document as being Syria, which may explain or help to explain the necessity of the anti-Jewish polemic in the collection.

The analysis of the present chapter has been built principally around those sayings that are sometimes called the more syncretistic ones. Our observations have established the fact that in these sayings certain Gnostic themes appear. This becomes extremely important for our interpretation of the entire collection, as well as for the individual units. At this point we must ask whether the less syncretistic, the more nearly Synoptic style sayings indicate the same themes and whether they have been adapted in a Gnostic milieu to serve as further media for an esoteric wisdom. In other words, do we find the same "life situation" for the formulation and use of the less syncretistic as for the more syncretistic sayings, or is the situation an altogether different one? What is the nature of the Synoptic type sayings and may they have any value for our understanding of the canonical sayings, or are they purely secondary? To these and other queries the following chapter addresses itself.

CHAPTER IV

THE USE OF CANONICAL SAYINGS AND NEW AGRAPHA

Introduction

In Chapter III we attempted to define the milieu of some of the sayings and the general trend of the entire collection in relation to three aspects of our document: (1) The category of literature into which Thomas may fall; (2) The probable use of it in a particular religious setting; (3) The literary and sectarian relationships that exist with the collection. We shall now endeavor to define that milieu and trend yet further. Our method shall be that of a critical analysis of two categories of sayings. The first group includes those sayings which are in appearance variants of canonical utterances or are based upon them. The second group is composed of representative parables and sayings that bear certain resemblances in form and substance to the canonical sayings but are not among those ascribed to Jesus in the New Testament. The present chapter does not pretend to be an exhaustive study of these two highly important groups of sayings. It is simply intended to be representative of a larger portion of the whole. A full treatment lies within the province of an exhaustive commentary, and that is not the design of this thesis.

The study will clarify whether the sayings depend on an early tradition, and if so, how early. Since the Gospel of Thomas has come to light, this problem has received considerable attention, both in Europe and in America.[1] New Testament scholars, as well as the public in general, are concerned with whether some genuine sayings of Jesus, hitherto unknown, have been preserved in our collection. In a measure the following study will illuminate the issues, evaluate the sayings, and tentatively solve the problem. We shall try to determine whether any of the sayings may be directly related to "Q," or may even be antecedent to "Q," or may simply be dependent upon the Synoptic Gospels in particular and our canonical New Testament in general. We shall also seek to interpret the sayings where the meaning is in doubt and where the meaning may cast some light upon the overall theological perspective of the document. Here one principle of interpretation shall be that we must try to understand individual sayings in terms of what seems to be the general theological orientation of the work as we have analyzed it up to this point. We must naturally exercise caution in artificially imposing a meaning upon the sayings which they cannot bear, but at the same time we shall look for modifications of canonical data, whether by omissions, additions, change of words, etc., that would suggest the manipulation of a text to support a certain theological bias. Finally, we must not fail to mention that the formal structure of the sayings will be considered, especially in some instances, for what possible insight it may give us concerning the origin and history of the sayings. By these means we shall arrive at a better understanding of the two categories examined below. With respect to those that are parallel to canonical sayings, we shall find that they are basically of a secondary, derivative nature. Most of them show clear dependence upon the canonical Gospels. As for the agrapha, most of which appear for the first time in our Coptic collection, we shall observe their tendentious character and their Gnostic implications.

---

[1] Grant, "Notes on the Gospel of Thomas;" Piper, op. cit., and "A New Gospel?" The Christian Century, LXXVII (January 27, 1960), 96-99; Quispel, "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament."

The Canonical Sayings in the _Gospel of Thomas_

Very close parallels.--There is not a single saying in the entire collection that is a literal translation of or exact parallel to the canonical text. Only two may be classified as very close parallels. They are the brief sayings numbered 35 and 56 in the translation. Each of them is placed in contiguity with the canonical text that they may be collated and that the resultant evidence may be carefully weighed.

Saying 35 (87:18-20)	_Mt. 15:14b_	_Lk. 6:39_
ΟΥΒ̄Λ̄ΛΕ ΕϤϢΑΝΣΩΚ	τυφλὸς δὲ	μήτι δύναται
ϨΗΤϤ Ν̄ΝΟΥΒ̄Λ̄ΛΕ	τυφλὸν ἐὰν	τυφλὸς τυφλὸν
	ὁδηγῇ,	ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ
ϢΑΥϨΕ Μ̄ΠΕΣΝΑΥ	ἀμφότεροι	ἀμφότεροι

ΕΠΕΣΗΤ ΕΥϨΙΕΙΤ[1]	εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται	εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται;

Saying 35 is very close to the Matthaean version of the saying, but it differs in the use of the tense of habitude ("they are both *wont to fall*") instead of the future in Matthew and Luke. It also adds the adverbial phrase ΕΠΕΣΗΤ, "downwards," for which there is no textual evidence in Matthew or Luke. In the context which Matthew gives the saying, the moral blindness of the Pharisees is indicated. The Lucan context interprets it in the sense that one must first himself be taught before he can be a teacher. The *Gospel of Thomas* does not give the saying any special context, and we are left in doubt as regards its intended meaning. We can detect no motive for the use of the tense of habitude instead of the future nor for the addition of the adverbial phrase meaning "downwards."

Are these features an attestation to a Semitic tradition underlying Saying 35? The evidence must be carefully sifted before we can draw a tentative conclusion. Returning to the matter of context, it is important to notice that both Matthew and Luke have invented their own setting for the saying, and its original meaning is no longer clear.[2] As stated above, what we have in the *Gospel of Thomas* is the bare saying, with no context given, in a form which may be parallel to, or more primitive than, either the Matthaean or Lucan form. The reason for making this assertion is that Saying 35 is a two-membered *mashal*[1] (here a proverb) which in form is very near several proverbs of the Old Testament. Compare Saying 35 with the following proverbs:

---

[1] "If a blind man leads a blind man, they are both wont to fall down into a pit."

[2] See Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (3 Auflage; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957), pp. 84, 103, and Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, trans. S. H. Hooke (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), p. 30, note 41, where Jeremias says, "In neither of the

Saying 35: "If a blind man leads a blind man,
they are both wont to fall down into a pit."

Pr. 20:20: "If one curses his father or his mother,
his lamp will be put out in utter darkness."

Pr. 22:27: "If you have nothing with which to pay,
why should your bed be taken from under you?"

Pr. 24:10: "If you faint in the day of adversity,
your strength is small."

Pr. 29:12: "If a ruler listens to falsehood,
all his officials will be wicked."

---

two Evangelists is the connection original: Mt. xv, 12-14 is an insertion by Matthew into the controversial discourse in Mk. vii, 1-23, and Lk. vi, 39f. is a Lucan insertion into the Sermon on the Plain, as is shown by a comparison of Lk. vi, 37-42 with Mt. vii, 1-5 and by the Lucan stylistic peculiarities in Lk. vi, 39a (εἶπεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν)."

[1] *Ibid*., pp. 17-18: "This word may mean in the common speech of post-biblical Judaism, without resorting to a formal classification, figurative forms of speech of every kind: parable, similitude, allegory, fable, proverb, oracular utterance, riddle, significant name, symbol, pseudonym, example (type), commonplace, argument, apology, refutation, jest." He adds that παραβολή in the New Testament may mean not only "parable" but also "'comparison' (Lk. v, 36; Mk. iii, 23) and 'symbol' (Heb. ix, 9; xi, 19; cf. Mk. iii, 28); in Lk. iv, 23 it should be rendered 'proverb' or 'commonplace'; in Mk. vii, 17 it means 'riddle' and in Lk. xiv, 7 simply 'rule.'"

Pr. 29:14: "If a king judges the poor with equity,
his throne will be established for ever."[1]

The argument favoring the primitive form of Saying 35 is not decisive. Upon the same basis, Mt. 5:14b could be the original, judging from its similarity with the above proverbs. Thus Saying 35 could have been derived from Mt. 5:14b with only slight modifications. The scribe could have intentionally added the adverbial phrase meaning "downwards" to make the figure more vivid. At the same time, we must admit that the presence of the tense of habitude in the second member of Saying 35 is not necessarily explained by the hypothesis of a slightly altered translation of Mt. 5:14b. Ordinarily the tense of habitude does not serve as a translation of the future, though it may be so used.[2] More often it is used to translate the Greek present indicative,[3] and it would be more logical to assume that the present indicative of the verb "fall" lies behind the Coptic text. Hence, this bit of linguistic evidence added to the matter of form suggests a text different from Mt. 15:14b lying behind the Coptic translation. The version of the saying represented in No. 35 may be as valid or primitive as that of Matthew; yet the issue cannot be settled conclusively. The text may have been altered intentionally, and the tense of habitude could have been employed to translate the future, even though such does not represent the customary use of the tense of habitude. Therefore, the issue is left in a state of suspension. One's subjective judgment may result in crediting the saying to a tradition prior to Matthew, parallel to Matthew, or secondary to Matthew.

---

[1] These citations are from the R S V, but the Hebrew text has been consulted to verify the accuracy of translation and the parallel in form to Saying 35 and Mt. 15:14b.

[2] Walter C. Till, Koptische Grammatik, Saidischer Dialekt (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1955), par. 304.

[3] See Mt. 12:43-45 in The Coptic Version of the New Testament . . . , I, 118.

The second example in the classification of "very close parallels" is Saying 56.

Saying 56 (90:23-24)	Mt. 5:3	Lk. 6:20
ϩN̄MAKAPIOΣ NE	Μακάριοι οἱ	Μακάριοι οἱ
NϩHKE ϪE	πτωχοὶ ἐν	πτωχοί, ὅτι
	πνεύματι, ὅτι	ὑμετέρα ἐστιν
TΩTN̄ TE	αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ	ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ
TMN̄TEPO	βασιλεία τῶν	θεοῦ.
NM̄ΠHYE[1]	οὐρανῶν.	

There is an interesting mixture of characteristics in Saying 56. It agrees with Luke against Matthew in the omission of the phrase "in spirit;" it also agrees with Luke against Matthew in the use of the second person plural pronoun in the second half of the beatitude; but with Matthew against Luke it has "kingdom of the heavens," instead of "kingdom of God." In the last characteristic it also agrees with sa bo (G_1 LS 18) it

---

[1] "Blessed are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven."

Tert Ambr.[1] Conflation of the canonical sources cannot be demonstrated in a brief saying like this one. Two things, however, should be remembered. In the first place Saying 56 is closer to Luke than to Matthew, and the Lucan version is generally recognized as more primitive than that of Matthew.[2] In the second place the preference for "kingdom of heaven" instead of "kingdom of God" suggests the possibility of a Jewish-Christian background for Saying 56; that is, if it is not dependent upon Matthew at this point. Therefore, while we may not say so with finality, Saying 56 may easily be an instance of the preservation of a very ancient tradition in our collection. It is not inconceivable that it is the original form of the saying recorded by Matthew and Luke.

Conflations.--There are six prominent examples in this group, and we shall examine them in relation to the Synoptic parallels.[3]

(1) Saying 14 (83:19-27)	Lk. 10:8-9
19 ΑΥΩ ΕΤΕΤΝ̄ 20 ϣΑΝΒΩΚ`	καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν
ΕϩΟΥΝ ΕΚΑϩ ΝΙΜ ΑΥΩ	πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε
Ν̄ΤΕΤ 21 Μ̄ΜΟΟϣΕ ϩΝ̄ Ν̄ΧΩΡΑ	καὶ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς,

---

[1] This is an instance of agreement of Thomas with the "Western Text." This problem needs to be dealt with in some detail.

[2] Wildred L. Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), II, 9-17.

[3] Other sayings which show a similar character of conflation are 22, 33, 39, 46, 57, 70, 74, 81, 94, 97, 100.

ΕΥϢΑΡ̄ΠΑΡΑΔΕΧΕ 22 Μ̄ΜΩΤΝ	ἐσθίετε τὰ	
ΠΕΤΟΥΝΑΚΑΑϤ ϨΑΡΩΤΝ̄	παρατιθέμενα	
ΟΥΟΜϤ̄ 23 ΝΕΤϢΩΝΕ Ν̄ϨΗΤΟΥ	ὑμῖν, καὶ	
ΕΡΙΘΕΡΑΠΕΥΕ	θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθενεῖς	
24 Μ̄ΜΟΟΥ	<u>Mt. 15:11</u>	<u>Mk. 7:15</u>
ΠΕΤΝΑΒΩΚ ΓΑΡ̀ ΕϨΟΥΝ	οὐ τὸ εἰσερχό-	οὐδέν ἐστιν ἔξωθεν
ϨΝ̄ 25 ΤΕΤΝΤΑΠΡΟ	μενον εἰς τὸ	τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
	στόμα	εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς
		αὐτὸν ὃ δύναται
ϤΝΑϪΩϨΜ̄ ΤΗΥΤΝ̄ ΑΝ`	κοινοῖ τὸν	κοινῶσαι αὐτόν·
ΑΛΛΑ 26 ΠΕΤΝ̄ΝΗΥ ΕΒΟΛ	ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ	ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ
ϨΝ̄ ΤΕΤΝ̄ΤΑΠΡΟ	τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον	ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευ-
	ἐκ τοῦ στόματος,	όμενα ἐστιν
Ν̄ΤΟϤ ΠΕΤΝ̄ΑϪΑϨΜ̄	τοῦτο κοινοῖ	τὰ κοινοῦντα
ΤΗΥΤΝ[1]	τὸν ἄνθρωπον.	τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

Down through 83:23/24 Saying 14 follows Lk. 10:8-9 rather closely. The fact that the sentence "Those who are sick among them, heal them," breaks the connection in the saying proves the use of the Synoptics by the <u>Gospel of Thomas</u> or its source. No attempt was made to smooth out the conflation by omitting the discrepant sentence from Lk. 10:9. Then the saying switches over and follows Mt. 15:11 // Mk. 7:15. It is closer to

---

[1] "And when you go forth into any land and walk in (its) districts, if they receive you, eat whatever they may set before you.--Those who are sick among them, heal them.--For what may go into your mouth will not defile you, but what comes out of your mouth is that which will defile you."

Matthew here than to Mark. Therefore we have what appears to be a conflation of two passages, one from Luke, one from Matthew, designed to follow the trend of Saying 13, which obviates ritual fasting, prayer, and giving of alms. Either the source of the Gospel of Thomas or the collection itself was dependent upon the Synoptics at this point.

(2) Saying 34 (87:10-18)	Mt. 10:27b	Lk. 12:3b
10 ΠΕϪΕ Ι̅Σ̅	καὶ	καὶ
11 ΠΕΤ̀ΚΝΑΣΩΤΜ̄ ΕΡΟϤ ϨΜ̄	ὃ εἰς τὸ οὖς	ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὖς
12 ΠΕΚΜΑΑϪΕ	ἀκούετε,	ἐλαλήσατε ἐν τοῖς
		ταμιείοις
ΤΑϢΕΟΕΙϢ̀ Μ̄ΜΟϤ	κηρύξατε	κηρυχθήσεται
ϨΙϪΝ̄ 13 ΝΕΤΝ̄ϪΕΝΕΠΩΡ	ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων.	ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων.
		Lk. 8:16
ΜΑΡΕΛΑΑῪ ΓΑΡ ϪΕΡΕ ϨΗΒ̅Σ̅		οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον
14 Ν̄ϤΚΑΑϤ·		ἅψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν
ϨΑ ΜΑΑϪΕ ΟΥΔΕ		σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω
ΜΑϤΚΑΑϤ· ϨΜ̄ ΜΑ 15 ΕϤϨΗΠ		κλίνης τίθησιν,
ΑΛΛΑ ΕϢΑΡΕϤΚΑΑϤ ϨΙϪΝ̄		ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ λυχνίας
16 ΤΛΥΧΝΙΑ ϪΕΚΑΑΣ		τίθησιν, ἵνα οἱ
ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ̀ ΕΤΒΗΚ̀ ΕϨΟΥΝ		εἰσπορευόμενοι
17 ΑΥΩ ΕΤΝ̄ΝΗΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΥΝΑΝΑΥ 18 ΑΠΕϤΟΥΟΕΙΝ		βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς.

Saying 34 is put together very skillfully with parallel members for each of the three units of the saying:

> [1]What you will hear with your ear,
> in the other ear proclaim it upon your roofs.

> [2]For one is not wont to light a lamp and put it under a measure, nor is one wont to put it in a concealed place; [3]but he is wont to put it upon the lampstand so that everyone who comes in and goes out may see its light.

The first unit is closest to Mt. 10:27b, while the second and third units are closest to Lk. 8:16 (//Mt. 5:15 // Mk. 4:21 // Lk. 11:33), though it seems that the phrase "under a measure" has been borrowed from Mt. 5:15 or Mk. 4:21 or Lk. 11:33. The varying applications of Mt. 10:27b // Lk. 12:3b and Lk. 8:16 (and parallels) shows that these sayings have been given an artificial context in the Synoptics and have been combined with other sayings to suit the purposes of the evangelists. For example, the saying about the "lamp on the lampstand" is used in Mk. 4:21 after the Parable of the Sower to explain the purpose of parables, in Mt. 5:15 with sayings on salt and light, and in Lk. 11:33 with the saying about the "eye" being the "lamp of the body." This suggests that the saying may be one of the proverbs spoken by Jesus that has become completely detached from its original "Sitz im Leben." Consequently, there is no reason to assume that Saying 34 represents a more original form than what we find in the Synoptics; in fact, we have grounds for assuming that it is less original than the Synoptic version. For example, we must reckon with the possibility that unit 1 was combined with units 2-3 by the Coptic translator's intentional use of the word **MAAϪE** in 2 (meaning "measure") to serve as a catch-word following **MAAϪE** in 1 (meaning "ear") in order to aid the initiate in memorizing the saying and learning its secret meaning! The usual word for translating μόδιος is ϣI, "measure, weight."[1] Finally, we must not make too much of the "semitisms" shown by the parallelism of members and the expression "everyone who comes in and goes out." Lk. 8:16 // Lk. 11:33 has "that the ones entering may see the light." Jeremias points out that this is evidence of Hellenistic architecture in Luke's gospel, indicating houses with vestibules, "from which the light shines out upon those who are entering."[2] The expression in Saying 34, which adds "everyone . . . who goes out" may indicate the same thing, thus testifying to a Hellenistic milieu for the saying and not a primitive Palestinian Jewish-Christian setting, as Quispel argues.[3]

(3) Saying 36 (87:20-24)	Mt. 12:29	Mk. 3:27	Lk. 11:21, 22
20 ΠΕϪΕ Ι̅Σ̅			
ΜΝ̄ ϬΟΜ	ἢ πῶς	ἀλλ᾽οὐ	ὅταν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς
21 Ν̄ΤΕΟΥΑ ΒΩΚ̀	δύναταί τις	δύναται	καθωπλισμένος
ΕϨΟΥΝ	εἰσελθεῖν	οὐδεὶς εἰς	φυλάσσῃ τὴν
	εἰς τὴν	τὴν	ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν,
ΕΠΗΕΙ	οἰκίαν	οἰκίαν	ἐν εἰρήνῃ

---

[1] Crum, Dictionary, pp. 213a, 548a. See also Mt. 5:15 and Mk. 4:21 in The Coptic Version of the New Testament . . . , I, 32, 402.

[2] Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 36, note 62.

[3] See Gilles Quispel, "L'Evangile selon Thomas et le Diatessaron," Vigiliae Christianae, XIII (July, 1959), 113.

[22] Μ̄ΠϪΩΩΡΕ	τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ	τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ	ἐστιν τὰ ὑπάρ-
Ν̄ϥϪΙΤϥ̄`	καὶ τὰ σκεύη	εἰσελθὼν	χοντα αὐτοῦ·
Ν̄ϪΝΑϨ	αὐτοῦ ἁρπά-	τὰ σκεύη	ἐπὰν δὲ ἰσχυ-
	σει,	διαρπάσαι,	ρότερος αὐτοῦ
ΕΙΜΗΤΙ	ἐὰν μὴ	ἐὰν μὴ	ἐπελθὼν νικήση
	πρῶτον	πρῶτον	αὐτόν, τὴν
Ν̄ϥΜΟΥΡ	δήσῃ τὸν	τὸν ἰσχυ-	πανοπλίαν
[23] Ν̄ΝΕϥϭΙϪ'	ἰσχυρόν;	ρὸν δήσῃ	αὐτοῦ αἴρει,
ΤΟΤΕ	καὶ τότε	καὶ τότε	ἐφ' ᾗ
ϥΝΑΠΩΩΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ	τὴν οἰκίαν	τὴν οἰκίαν	ἐπεποίθει,
[24] Μ̄ΠΕϥΗΕΙ[1]	αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ	καὶ τὰ σκῦλα
	δαρπάσει.	διαρπάσει.	αὐτοῦ δια-
			δίδωσιν.

Saying 36 is not a clear instance of conflation of Synoptic passages, but it is given here because it is possible that it shows acquaintance with the Synoptic versions. The Coptic version of the saying is closer to Mark than to Matthew or Luke. Matthew has the question form, which is not found in Mark or the Gospel of Thomas, and the expanded form which Luke gives the passage is quite different from the others.[2] However, the expression "take it (him?) in violence" sounds somewhat like Luke 11:22b: τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἴρει . Even so "take it (him?) in violence" is not a translation of Lk. 11:22b. It may be either a free rendering of Mark with a slight flavoring from Luke, or else it is from an altogether different tradition. The latter possibility must not be overruled, although we cannot prove this.

---

[1] Jesus said, "It is impossible for one to enter into the house of the strong man and to take it in violence except he bind his hands; then he will plunder his house."

[2] Knox, op. cit., p. 62, asserts that the radical difference of the Lucan account shows that Luke follows a non-Markan source, although Mark records the passage.

As for the meaning of Saying 36, we do not know whether "the strong man" is to be identified with Satan and the one who overcomes him is Jesus (or God),[1] or whether it is intended by the compiler to be but a figurative expression of Jesus having "overcome the world."[2] The second choice would fit the context of the collection better, whereas the first is the meaning intended by the Synoptics.

(4) Saying 39 (88:2-7)	Mt. 13:17	Lk. 10:24
2 ΠΕϪΕ Ι̅Σ̅ ϪΕ	ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν	λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν
ϨΑϨ Ν̅ΣΟΠ	ὅτι πολλοὶ	ὅτι πολλοὶ
	προφῆται καὶ	προφῆται καὶ
3 ΑΤΕΤΝ̅ΡΕΠΙΘΥΜΕΙ	δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμη-	βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν
ΕΣΩΤΜ̅ ΑΝΕΕΙϢΑϪΕ	σαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπ-	ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπ-
4 ΝΑΕΙ ΕϮϪΩ Μ̅ΜΟΟΥ	ετε, καὶ οὐκ εἶ-	ετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν,
ΝΗΤΝ̅ ΑΥΩ ΜΝ̅ΤΗΤΝ̅	δαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι	καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ
5 ΚΕΟΥΑ ΕΣΟΤΜΟΥ Ν̅ΤΟΟΤϤ̅	ἃ ἀκούετε, καὶ	ἀκούετε καὶ
	οὐκ ἤκουσαν.	οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

---

[1] Bultmann, op. cit., p. 103.

[2] Jn. 16:33. See Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 151.

	Lk. 17:22a
6 ΟΥΝ̄ ϩΝ̄ϩΟΟΥ ΝΑϢΩΠΕ	ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι . . .
	Jn. 7:34a
Ν̄ΤΕΤΝ̄ϢΙΝΕ Ν̄ΣΩΕΙ	ζητήσετέ με καὶ
ΤΕΤΝΑϨΕ ΑΝ ΕΡΟΕΙ·[1]	οὐχ εὑρήσετε

Saying 39 looks very much like a composition made up of phrases drawn from the passages given in parallel above. If so, we have here an example of dependence upon Matthew or Luke and John, by either the Gospel of Thomas or the source used in compiling the sayings. A shorter and slightly different version of the same saying was known among the Morcosian Gnostics: ἐν τῷ εἰρηκέναι· πολλάκις ἐπεθύμησαν ἀκοῦσαι ἕνα τῶν λόγων τούτων, και οὐκ ἔσχον τον ἐροῦντα.[2] We should notice that there is a reflection of the eschatological interest of the canonical gospels here and elsewhere in the collection,[3] although this interest has been almost completely changed.[4]

(5) Saying 40 (85:7-13)	Mt. 23:13	Lk. 11:52
7 ΠΕϪΕ ΙΣ̄ ϪΕ	οὐαὶ δὲ ὑμῖν	οὐαὶ ὑμῖν
8 ΜΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΟΣ ΜΝ̄	γραμματεῖς καὶ	τοῖς νομικοῖς

---

[1] Jesus said, "Many times you desired to hear these words which I am saying to you, and you had not another by whom to hear them. Days are coming when you shall seek me and not find me."

[2] Ireneus Adv. Haer. I. 20. 2 // Epiphanius Haer. XXXIV. 18, quoted in Resch, op. cit., p. 179.

[3] Sayings 21, 53, 59, 90, 114.

[4] See chap. vi, p. 247, on Eschatology.

Ⲛ̄ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΣ	φαρισαῖοι ὑπο-	
ΑΥϪΙ Ⲛ̄ϢΑϢΤ`	κριταί, ὅτι	ὅτι
9 Ⲛ̄ΤΓΝΩΣΙΣ	κλείετε τὴν	ἄρατε τὴν
ΑΥϨΟΠΟΥ	βασιλείαν τῶν	κλεῖδα τῆς
	οὐρανῶν ἔμπροσ-	γνώσεως·
	θεν τῶν ἀνθρώ-	
	πων· ὑμεῖς γὰρ	αὐτοὶ
ΟΥΤΕ Ⲙ̄ΠΟΥΒΩΚ	οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε,	οὐκ εἰσῆλθατε,
10 ΕϨΟΥΝ ΑΥΩ	οὐδὲ τοὺς	καὶ τοὺς
ΝΕΤΟΥΩϢ ΕΒΩΚ`	εἰσερχομένους	εἰσερχομένους
11 ΕϨΟΥΝ ΜΠΟΥΚΑΑΥ	ἀφίετε	ἐκωλύσατε.
	εἰσελθεῖν.	
	<u>Mt. 10:16</u>	
	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω	
	ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα	
	ἐν μέσῳ λύκων·	
Ⲛ̄ΤΩΤⲚ̄ ΔΕ ϢΩΠΕ Ⲙ̄ΦΡΟΝΙΜΟΣ	γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι	
12 Ⲛ̄ΘΕ Ⲛ̄ΝϨΟϤ` ΑΥΩ	ὡς οἱ ὄφεις καὶ	
Ⲛ̄ΑΚΕΡΑΙΟΣ Ⲛ̄ΘΕ	ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ	
13 Ⲛ̄ΝϭΡΟΜΠΕ[1]	περιστεραί.	

Saying 40 seems to begin with the use of "Pharisees and Scribes" from Mt. 23:13 (reversing the order) and then follows Lk. 11:52 in a modified form. The latter portion of the saying is parallel to Mt. 10:16b, which occurs nowhere else in the canonical gospels, and is as close to a literal rendition of Mt. 10:16b as it could possibly be. The most likely conclusion is that there is direct dependence upon the Synoptics by the compiler or his source.

---

[1] Jesus said, "The Pharisees and the Scribes have taken the keys of knowledge (and) hidden them; they neither went in nor did they permit those who wished to go in. But you, be wise as serpents and harmless (innocent) as doves."

There are also two points of contact with the "Western Text." The "Western" witnesses (D (Θ) 157 it sy^{sc}) substitute ἐκρύψατε for ἤρατε in Lk. 11:52. In 85:8, 9, the *Gospel* of Thomas shows familiarity with both readings in that both verbs are used in telling what the "Pharisees and Scribes" did with the "keys of knowledge." This fact is important in proving familiarity not with one, but with two distinct textual traditions of the New Testament, that represented mainly by D, and that represented chiefly by ℵ B. The second point of contact with the "Western Text" comes through a parallel with the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*.[1] In Saying 40 the clause "those who wished to enter" (different from both Mt. and Lk.) is identical to *Hom*. XVIII. 16: οὔτε τοῖς βουλομένοις εἰσελθεῖν παρέσχον . . . .[2] The opinion of Quispel on the relation of the *Gospel of Thomas* to the "Western Text" is thus valid, although the broad conclusions to which he comes are not entirely justified by the evidence.[3]

---

[1] The Pseudo-Clementine Literature is generally recognized as containing important "Western" readings.

[2] *Pat. Gr*., II, col. 417.

[3] Above, chap. iii, p.101, note 5.

(6) Saying 78 (94:13-22)	Mt. 13:45-46
13 ΠΕϪΕ ῙΣ̄ ϪΕ	πάλιν
14 ΤΜΝ̄ΤΕΡΟ Μ̄ΠΕΙΩΤ` ΕΣΤΝ̄ΤΩΝ	ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία
15 ΑΥΡΩΜΕ Ν̄ΕϢΩΩΤ΄	τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐμπόρῳ
ΕΥΝ̄ΤΑϤ Μ̄ΜΑΥ	ζητοῦντι καλοὺς
16 Ν̄ΟΥΦΟΡΤΙΟΝ ΕΑϤϨΕ	μαργαρίτας· εὑρὼν δὲ
ΑΥΜΑΡΓΑΡΙΤΗΣ	ἕνα πολύτιμον μαργαρίτην
17 ΠΕϢΩΤ` ΕΤΜ̄ΜΑΥ ΟΥΣΑΒΕ	
ΠΕ ΑϤϮ ΠΕΦΟΡΤΙΟΝ 18 ΕΒΟΛ	ἀπελθὼν πέπρακεν πάντα
ΑϤΤΟΟΥ ΝΑϤ` Μ̄ΠΙΜΑΡΓΑΡΙΤΗΣ	ὅσα εἶχεν καὶ ἠγόρασεν
19 ΟΥΩΤ΄	αὐτόν.

	Mt. 6:20	Lk. 12:33b
Ν̄ΤΩΤΝ̄ ϨΩΤ΄ ΤΗΥΤΝ̄	θησαυρίζετε	ποιήσατε
20 ϢΙΝΕ Ν̄ΣΑ ΠΕϤΕϨΟ	δὲ ὑμῖν	ἑαυτοῖς
ΕΜΑϤΩϪΝ̄ ΕϤΜΗΝ`	θησαυροὺς ἐν	βαλλάντια μὴ
21 ΕΒΟΛ ΠΜΑ	οὐρανῷ, ὅπου	παλαιούμενα,
		θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπ-
		τον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,
ΕΜΑΡΕϪΟΟΛΕΣ	οὔτε σὴς οὔτε	ὅπου κλέπτης οὐκ
ΤϨΝΟ ΕϨΟΥΝ` ΕΜΑΥ	βρῶσις ἀφανί-	ἐγγίζει οὐδὲ σὴς
22 ΕΟΥΩΜ` ΟΥΔΕ	ζει, καὶ ὅπου	διαφθείρει·
ΜΑΡΕϤϤΝ̄Τ ΤΑΚΟ[1]	κλέπται οὐ	
	διορρύσσουσιν	
	οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν.	

---

[1] Jesus said, "The kingdom of the Father is like a merchant who had a cargo. When that merchant, who was wise,

Saying 78 is of unusual interest. Through 94:18/19 it appears to be dependent on Mt. 13:45-46, the brief parable of the "costly pearl." It differs from the Matthaean version in using the term "kingdom of the Father" instead of "kingdom of heaven." Next the merchant is said to have a "cargo" and then "found the pearl." In Matthew he is one who "seeks fine pearls." Quite distinctive in Saying 78 is the description of the merchant as ΣΑΒΕ, "wise." He sells the ΦΟΡΤΙΟΝ, not πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν (Mt. 13:46). Instead of Matthew's πολύτιμον μαργαρίτην he buys the "single pearl."

The parable is then given an application by what seems to be a variant of Mt. 6:20 (Note the advice to "seek after his (the merchant's) treasure," the "single pearl."). However, 94:19-22 may not be simply a variant of Mt. 6:20. The verb ΩϪN̄, "cease, perish," may translate the Greek verbs ἐκλείπειν, ἀνεκλείπειν, παύειν, etc.[1] ΩϪN̄ seems to be an echo of ἀνέκλειπτον of Lk. 12:33b, which refers to "unfailing treasure." Similarly, ΤϨΝΟ may recall ἐγγίζειν, though in Saying 78 it refers to "moth" and not to "thief" as in Luke.[2] In view

---

found a pearl, he sold the cargo (and) bought for himself the single pearl. You also, seek after his treasure, which is not wont to perish, since it abides where no moth is wont to come nigh to eat, nor worm is wont to destroy."

[1] Crum, Dictionary, p. 539.

[2] Ibid., p. 460b gives no instance of ΤϨΝΟ translating ἐγγίζειν. Nevertheless, the appearance is that of a combination of elements from Mt. 6:20 and Lk. 12:33b.

of the fact that the Synoptic gospels contain parables that were frequently given explanatory additions at the end, we may conclude that a similar process is at work here. The secondary conclusions given by the Synoptists, which conclusions often distorted the original meaning of the parables, suggests an intentional editing of a similar type in the Gospel of Thomas.[1] Even though it is skillfully pieced together, Saying 78 bears the marks of conflation of literary sources, probably our Synoptics themselves.

In Saying 78 "the kingdom" is like "the pearl" (as in Matthew),[2] not "the merchant," but the pearl (=kingdom) is probably to be equated with the inner self or the soul. Most likely the meaning is the same as what we find in the so-called "Hymn of the Pearl" in the Acts of Thomas, which symbolizes the soul as being lost in the material world but found again after a diligent search.[3]

Similarities to the Synoptic order.--The sayings to be dealt with here are pointed out to show probable dependence upon the Synoptics.[4] We shall first consider Sayings 21 and

---

[1] See Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, pp. 80-88. cf. Mt. 21:41b; 22:14; Mk. 2:19b-20; Lk. 5:39; 12:21, 47-48; 19:27.

[2] Ibid., p. 79.

[3] See James, op. cit., pp. 411-415, and Piper, "The Gospel of Thomas," p. 22.

[4] Sayings 94 and 95 fall in this category, as well as those dealt with above and on the following pages.

22, which logically belong together but have been separated in the translation to draw attention to the tendential nature of 21 as against the Synoptic character of 22.

> Saying 21: Mary said to Jesus, "Whom do your disciples resemble?" He said, "They are like little children visiting (dwelling at) a field which is not theirs. When the owners of the field come, they will say, 'Leave our field to us.' They (the children) strip (themselves) naked before them in order to leave it (the field) to them and give (their) field (back) to them."
>
> Saying 22: "Because of this I say, if the master of the house knows that the thief is coming, he will be awake (wakeful) before he comes, and he will not let him dig into his house of his kingdom to [take away] his goods. But you, be awake before (watch out for?) the world. Gird yourselves over your loins with a great power in order that the robbers may find no way to come upon you. For the weakness (?) which you anticipate they will find. May there be a man of understanding in your midst! When the fruit had ripened, he came in haste with his sickle in his hand, (and) he harvested it. He who has ear to hear, let him hear!"

At first glance, Saying 21 does not appear to have any relationship to the Synoptics, but a more careful examination shows that it may be a parable based upon Mt. 24:40: "Then there will be two in the field; one is taken away and one is left."[1] Then follows in Mt. 24:43-44 // Lk. 12:39-40 the saying about the householder watching for the thief in the night, which is the Synoptic parallel to Saying 22. Therefore, since the order of the Gospel of Thomas is the same as that of Matthew at this point, either the compiler or his source was acquainted with canonical Matthew.[1]

---

[1] Grant and Freedman, *op. cit.*, p. 141, have suggested this possibility. Their analysis seems to be valid. Saying 21 seems completely Gnostic in character. Leipoldt, *op. cit.*, col. 485, gives the interpretation of H.-M. Schenke: "'Sie (die Kinder) sind nackt' usw. und vertritt die Auffassung: 'vermutlich bedeutet das Feld die Welt, die Besitzer die Archonten, die Freigabe des Feldes den Tod, wobei die Seele den Kosmos nackt verlaesst.'"

Our second example pertains to Sayings 67 and 68 in relation to the Parable of the Wicked Tenants (Mt. 21:33-46 // Mk. 12:1-12 // Lk. 20:9-19). The Coptic sayings contain interesting divergences from the Synoptic accounts,[2] but our primary purpose here deals with the matter of the order of the sayings. The Synoptics conclude their versions of the parable with the quotation of Psalm 118:22-23, on "the very stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner . . . ." The Gospel of Thomas makes a separate, brief saying of the quotation: Jesus said, "Show me this stone which the builders rejected; it is the cornerstone." The order of Sayings 67 and 68 is identical with that of the Synoptics;[1] this leads us to believe that the Synoptic gospels were used for the composition of the collection.

---

[1] We should add that Saying 22 is a product of compilation of Synoptic data, containing echoes of Mt. 12:29 // Mk. 3:27 // Lk. 11:21-22 and Mk. 4:29 and Mt. 11:15, etc. The similarity of 85:17-18 with Mk. 4:29 proves that the compiler or his source knew the Gospel of Mark. Mk. 4:29 is not found in any of the other canonical gospels.

[2] With regard to these differences, Saying 67 mentions only two servants and the son of the owner of the vineyard. Matthew has an indefinite number of servants, Mark and Luke have three servants and a "beloved son." The christological implications of the "beloved son" reference are clear, as is the case with the inference that the Jews are the vinedressers and Jesus is the "beloved son" whom they killed. Further expansion of the parable is indicated in the statement that the owner will take away the vineyard and give it to others, meaning that the Jews will be disinherited and the Gentiles will receive the inheritance of the "beloved son." Quispel has argued in "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament," pp. 205, 206, that the absence of all these secondary features from Saying 67 proves that it is an early form antecedent to the Synoptic version and that its lack of anti-Jewish polemic indicates a very early Jewish-Christian environment for it. This appears to be a rather forceful argument in view of the fact that elsewhere the Gospel of Thomas does not hesitate to make anti-Judaic statements. Why not here also? Were they not in the sources utilized? Or is it simply that such did not serve the immediate purpose? In spite of the apparent merit of Quispel's contentions, the very evidence which he uses to argue for the primitive nature of Saying 67 can equally well be turned in the opposite direction! For example, the Gospel of Thomas intentionally omits all references to the Old

Reversals of the canonical order.--In this group of sayings we include those that seem to be dependent upon the canonical text but for some reason reverse the order of the sayings as they are found in the Synoptic gospels. Two sayings

---

Testament, perhaps dictated by an aversion for all things Jewish. In accord with this tendency, Saying 67 omits the reference to Isa. 5:2 about the planting of the vineyard (mt. 21:33 // Mk. 12:1 // Lk. 20:9), and in Saying 68 no allusion whatever is made to Ps. 118:22-23 (Mt. 21:42 // Mk. 12:10-11 // Lk. 20:17). Finally, we observe that the point of the parable in Saying 67 is obscured by the failure to mention the owner's departure to "another country." This is to say that the Synoptic parable, purged of secondary allegorization, is meaningful only in terms of the practice of absentee landlord-ism in first century Palestine. It would have been absurd for the tenants to believe that the killing of the "sole heir" would have given them possession of the land except for the fact that such was the legal right of Palestinian peasants living on the land of a foreign owner who died without heirs. See Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, pp. 58, 59. This point is totally obscured in Saying 67 and testifies to its secondary nature. cf. Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 172.

[1] See also Sayings 94, 95 (Mt. 7:6, 8b // Lk. 11:9b, 10b), and Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 172.

are quoted below with their corresponding members from the New Testament.

(1) Saying 32 (87:5-7)	Lk. 4:24, 23
5 ΠΕϪΕ Ι̅Σ̅	24 εἶπεν δέ· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι
6 ΜΝ̅ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ϢΗΠ	οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν
ϨΜ̅ ΠΕϤϮΜΕ	ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.
	23 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· πάντως
	ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην·
7 ΜΑΡΕΣΟΕΙΝ Ρ̅ΘΕΡΑΠΕΥΕ	ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν·
Ν̅ΝΕΤ̀ΣΟΟΥΝ Μ̅ΜΟϤ[1]	
	ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα εἰς
	τὴν Καφαρναούμ, ποίησον καὶ
	ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου.

The first member of Saying 32 is closer to Lk. 4:24 than to the parallels in Mt. 13:57 and Mk. 6:4. The second member appears to be a creation based upon Lk. 4:23.[2]

(2) Saying 49 (89:17-23)	Lk. 5:39, 37, 38, 36
17 ΜΑΡΕΡΩΜΕ ΣΕ Ρ̅ΠΑΣ	39 καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὼν παλαιὸν
18 ΑΥΩ Ν̅ΤΕΥΝΟΥ Ν̅ϤΕΠΙΘΥΜΕΙ	θέλει
ΑΣΩ ΗΡΠ̀ 19 Β̅ΒΡΡΕ	νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς
	χρηστός ἐστιν.
ΑΥΩ ΜΑΥΝΟΥϪ̀ ΗΡΠ· Β̅ΒΡ̅ΡΕ	37 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον

---

[1] Jesus said, "There is no prophet accepted in his own village; a physician is not wont to cure those who know him."

[2] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., pp. 149, 150.

[20]ΕΑΣΚΟΣ Ν̄ΑΣ ϪΕΚΑΑΣ	εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ
Ν̄ΝΟΥΠΩϨ	μή γε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος
	τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ αὐτὸς
	ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται·
	[38] ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς
	καινοὺς βλητέον.
ΑΥΩ [21]ΜΑΥΝΕϪ'	
ΗΡΠ· Ν̄ΑΣ ΕΑΣΚΟΣ Β̄ΒΡ̄ΡΕ	
ϢΙΝΑ ϪΕ [22]ΝΕϤΤΕΚΑϤ'	
ΜΑΥϪ̄Λ̄Ϭ̄ ΤΟΕΙΕ Ν̄ΑΣ ΑϢΤΗΝ	[36] οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ἀπὸ ἱματίου
[23]Ν̄ϢΑΕΙ ΕΠΕΙ ΟΥΝ ΟΥΠΩϨ	καινοῦ σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ
ΝΑϢΩΠΕ[1]	ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μή
	γε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίσει καὶ
	τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ
	ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ.
	Mk. 2:21
	οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου
	ἐπιράπτει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν·
	εἰ δὲ μή, αἴρει τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ'
	αὐτοῦ τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ,
	καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται.

---

[1] "A man is not wont to drink old (wine) and immediately wish to drink new wine; and one is not wont to put new wine into old wineskin(s) lest they burst, and one is not wont to put old wine into a new wineskin lest it (the skin) spoil it (the wine). One is not wont to sew an old rag on a new garment since a tear would occur."

The comparison of the texts given above shows the peculiar arrangement given to the Synoptic material by the _Gospel of Thomas_ at this point. It is clear that the collection depends upon the Synoptic Gospels. The conclusion (Lk. 5:39) which Luke gives to the Parable of the Old and New Wine is placed at the beginning of Saying 49. This conclusion is secondary in nature and destroys the meaning of the parable, which is that the new wine (a symbol of the "New Age") is incompatible with the old. Luke's addition reverses the meaning and makes the old superior to the new.[1] Saying 49 then continues parallel to Lk. 5:37 // Mk. 2:22 // Mt. 9:17, but adds a sentence about putting "old wine into new wineskins," which is not present in the Synoptic version and seems to be a conscious attempt to round out the parallelism. The saying closes with "One is not wont to sew an old rag on a new garment since a tear would occur." This is analogous to Lk. 5:36 // Mk. 2:21 // Mt. 9:16. The Synoptic version has a "new patch on an old garment." The rendition in Saying 49 sounds artificial in that few people would consider mending a new garment with an old rag, and an old garment would more likely need repairing than a new one. Hence, Saying 49 is clearly secondary. It is not necessary to postulate an independent tradition in order to explain the component parts of Saying 49.[1]

---

[1] Jeremias, _The Parables of Jesus_, p. 80.

<u>Abbreviations (?) of canonical material</u>.--We shall examine below three sayings which appear to be abbreviated versions of parallel sayings in the Synoptic gospels.[2] While a definitive conclusion may not be drawn in each instance, the following analyses are essential in attempting to determine the relationship of the Coptic version of the sayings to their Synoptic counterparts.

(1) <u>Saying 27 (86:12-17)</u>	<u>Mt. 7:3-5</u>	<u>Lk. 6:41-42</u>
12 ΠΕϪΕ Ι̅Σ̅ ϪΕ		
	3 τί δὲ βλέπεις	41 τί δὲ βλέπεις
ΠϪΗ	τὸ κάρφος τὸ	τὸ κάρφος τὸ
13 ΕΤϨΜ̄ ΠΒΑΛ	ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ	ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ
Μ̄ΠΕΚΣΟΝ	τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ	τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ
ΚΝΑΥ ΕΡΟϤ`	σοῦ,	σοῦ
14 ΠΣΟΕΙ ΔΕ ΕΤϨΜ̄	τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ	τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν
ΠΕΚΒΑΛ	σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ	ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ
	δοκὸν οὐ	ὀφθαλμῷ οὐ
ΚΝΑΥ ΑΝ ΕΡΟϤ`	κατανοεῖς;	κατανοεῖς;
	4 ἢ πῶς ἐρεῖς	42 πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν
	τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου·	τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου·
	ἄφες ἐκβάλω	ἀδελφέ, ἄφες ἐκβάλω

---

[1] Other sayings show a similar tendency to reverse the canonical order: See Nos. 92 (Mt. 11:28, 30, 29); 94 (Mt. 7:7b, 6).

[2] Further examples of abbreviations of canonical sayings are Nos. 48, 65, 91, 101.

	τὸ κάρφος ἐκ	τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν
	τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ	τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου,
	σου, καὶ ἰδοὺ	αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν
	ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ	τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου
ϩΟΤΑΝ	ὀφθαλμῷ σου,	δοκὸν οὐ βλέπων;
[15] ΕΚϣΑΝΝΟΥϫΕ	[5] ὑποκριτά, ἔκ-	ὑποκριτά, ἔκ-
Μ̄ΠΣΟΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ϩΜ̄	βαλε πρῶτον ἐκ	βαλε πρῶτον τὴν
[16] ΠΕΚ̀ΒΑΛ	τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ	δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ
	σου τὴν δοκόν,	ὀφθαλμοῦ σου,
ΤΟΤΕ	καὶ τότε δια-	καὶ τότε δια-
ΚΝΑΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ	βλέψεις ἐκβαλ-	βλέψεις τὸ κάρφος
ΕΝΟΥϫΕ Μ̄ΠϫΗ ΕΒΟΛ	εῖν τὸ κάρφος	τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ
ϩΜ̄ΠΒΑΛ	ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ	τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου
Μ̄ΠΕΚΣΟΝ	τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ	ἐκβαλεῖν.
	σου.	
		Oxy. Pap. 1:1
		καὶ τότε δια-
		βλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν
		τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν
		τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ
		ἀδελφοῦ σοῦ.

The parallel structure of Saying 27 is impressive:

"The chip that is in the eye of your brother you see;
but the beam that is in your eye you do not see.
Whenever you throw the beam out of your eye,
then you will see (how) to throw the chip out of

the eye of your brother."

The form of the saying may lead one to the assumption that we have here an early, possibly very early, tradition, but we must test it in terms of its agreements with and variants from Matthew and Luke in order to determine its origin.

First we must consider the context of the saying. As Saying 25 indicates, the Gospel of Thomas has Jesus talking with His disciples, but this cannot be determinative for the original situation. Both Matthew and Luke put the saying in the context of an address of Jesus to His disciples.[1] Bultmann points out the artificiality of the setting given by both gospels, but he does not speculate on the original situation out of which the saying grew.[2] Jeremias shows that in the transmission of the sayings of Jesus there was a strong tendency to change the context; whereas Jesus had originally addressed the crowd or His opponents, the evangelists take the same sayings and have Jesus speak them to the disciples.[3] Jeremias postulates that the presence of the word "hypocrite" in Mt. 7:5 // Lk. 6:42b (the term does not occur in Saying 27) shows that the utterance was first spoken to the Pharisees. Nowhere else in the Synoptics are the disciples referred to as "hypocrites,"[1] although the Scribes and Pharisees are frequently so called.[2] Now the contention of Jeremias depends upon the presence of "hypocrite" in Mt. 7:5 // Lk. 6:42b. The close agreement between the two gospels at this point shows that their source ("Q") contained the word. This leaves us two alternatives: (1) "Q" represents the more original form of the saying. If so, it may have been a "conflict saying," judging from the word "hypocrite." Saying 27 would be secondary and likely derivative from Matthew and Luke. (2) Our Coptic version is antecedent to "Q" at this point and is closer to the original utterance of Jesus. There are several reasons why the first alternative is the more likely of the two. The vividness of the saying in the "Q" version suggests originality. It seems unlikely that a secondary amplification would embody such characteristics. In addition there is not any reason to suppose that the presence of "hypocrite" in the canonical text is secondary. The Synoptics tend to amplify the conflicts of Jesus with the Scribes and Pharisees, but there would be no reason to retain the word in the setting which the evangelists give the saying because no opponents of Jesus are mentioned there. Consequently, the use of the word rests upon reliable tradition. But the most devastating blow to the assumption that Saying 27 depends upon a pre-Synoptic tradition is the fact that the latter portion of the Coptic version is identical with Mt. 7:5b, whereas the same portion of the saying in Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1 is identical with Lk. 6:42c.[1] This proves conclusively that the Greek version of the Gospel of Thomas represented by Oxy. Pap. 1 relied more upon Luke's rendition of the saying, whereas our Coptic text stayed closer to the text of Matthew at this point. Such textual similarities are not the product of chance! The only conclusion, therefore, is that Saying 27 depends upon the canonical text and is the result of a process of editing.

---

[1] Mt. 5-7 (The Sermon on the Mount) // Lk. 6:20-29 (The Sermon on the Plain).

[2] Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 49, 90.

[3] Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 23-29.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 124, note 95.

[2] See esp. Mt. 23:13, 15, 25, 26, 27, 29.

(2) Saying 59 (90:32-91:7)	Mt. 13:24-30
[32] [33] ΠΕϪΕ Ι̅Σ̅ ϪΕ	[24] "Αλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν
	αὐτοῖς λέγων· ὁμοιώθη ἡ
ΤΜ̅Ν̅ΤΕΡΟ Μ̅ΠΕΙΩΤ ΕΣΤΝΤΩΝ	βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ
[34] ΑΥΡΩΜΕ ΕΥΝ̅ΤΑϤ Μ̅ΜΑΥ Ν̅ΝΟΥϬΡΟϬ	σπείραντι καλὸν σπέρμα ἐν τῷ
[35] [ΕΝΑΝΟΥ]Ϥ`	ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ.
	[25] ἐν δὲ τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἀνθρώ-
ΑΠΕϤϪΑϪΕ ΕΙ Ν̅ΤΟΥϢΗ`	πους ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρὸς καὶ
[91:1] ΑϤΣΙΤΕ Ν̅ΟΥΖΙΖ̣ΑΝΙΟ̣Ν	ἐπέσπειραν ζιζάνια ἀνὰ μέσον
ΜΝ ΠΕϬΡΟ[Ϭ Ε][2]ΤΝΑΝΟΥϤ·	τοῦ σίτου καὶ ἀπῆλθεν. [26] ὅτε δὲ
	ἐβλάστησεν ὁ χόρτος καὶ καρπὸν
	ἐποίησεν, τότε ἐφάνη καὶ τὰ
	ζιζάνια. [27] προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ
	δοῦλοι τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου εἶπον

---

[1] The saying is only partially extant in Oxy. Pap. 1. See above, chap. ii, p. 69.

M̅ΠΕΠΡΩΜΕ ΚΟΟΥ
[3]ΕϨΩΛΕ M̅ΠΖΙΖΑΝΙΟΝ
ΠΕϪΑϤ ΝΑΥ ϪΕ ΜΗΠΩΣ [4]N̅ΤΕΤN̅ΒΩΚ
ϪΕ ΕΝΑϨΩΛΕ M̅ΠΖΙΖΑΝΙΟΝ
[5]N̅ΤΕΤN̅ϨΩΛΕ M̅ΠΣΟΥΟ ΝM̅ΜΑϤ' ϨM̅
[6]ΦΟΟΥ ΓΑΡ M̅ΠΩϨ̅Σ̅ N̅ΖΙΖΑΝΙΟΝ
ΝΑΟΥΩΝϨ [7]ΕΒΟΛ

ΣΕϨΟΛΟΥ

N̅ΣΕΡΟΚϨΟΥ[1]

αὐτῷ· κύριε, οὐχὶ καλὸν
σπέρμα ἔσπειρας ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ;
πόθεν οὖν ἔχει ζιζάνια; [28] ὁ δὲ
ἔφη αὐτοῖς· ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος
τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. οἱ δὲ δοῦλοι
αὐτῷ λέγουσιν· θέλεις οὖν ἀπελθόντες συλλέξωμεν αὐτά;
[29] ὁ δὲ φησιν· οὔ, μήποτε
συλλέγοντες τὰ ζιζάνια ἐκριζώσητε ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σῖτον.
[30] ἄφετε συναυξάνεσθαι ἀμφότερα
ἕως τοῦ θερισμοῦ· καὶ ἐν καιρῷ
τοῦ θερισμοῦ ἐρῶ τοῖς θερισταῖς·
συλλέξατε πρῶτον τὰ ζιζάνια
καὶ δήσατε αὐτὰ εἰς δέσμας
πρὸς τὸ κατακαῦσαι αὐτά, τὸν
δὲ σῖτον συναγάγετε εἰς
τὴν ἀποθήκην μου.

The Parable of the Wheat and the Tares is special Matthaean material. The only possible counterpart to it is the Secretly Growing Seed of Mk. 4:26-29.[2] Although we may not demonstrate the matter with such clarity as with the preceding example (Saying 27), Saying 59 bears the marks of intentional abridgment. As a result it has several peculiar features which would stand out even more prominently had we not Matthew's version as a basis for comparison. To begin with, it is strange that "the man" is merely described as "having good seed," whereas Matthew is much clearer in portraying him as "having sown good seed in his field." We should notice that a dialogue between the owner of the field and his servants (?) is suggested in Saying 59, but the dialogue form has been cut away so severely that there is no antecedent for "them" whom "the man" forbad to pluck the tares prematurely. We notice also that while it is implied in Saying 59, as it is clearly indicated in Matthew, that the problem is the separation of the wheat from the tares, the Coptic version obscures this point with a single climactic emphasis--the destruction of the tares.

---

[1] Jesus said, "The kingdom of the Father is like a man who had [goo]d seed. His enemy came in the night (and) sowed a tare [among] the good se[ed]. The man did not permit them to pluck the tare. He said to them, '(No;) lest you should come that we might pluck the tare and you should pluck the wheat with it.' For on the day of harvest the tares will be revealed. They are plucked and burned."

[2] It has been maintained that Mt. 13:24-30 is either a

Matthaean or pre-Matthaean expansion of Mk. 4:26-29 into an allegory. The verbal similarities are striking, and it should be pointed out that Mt. 13 follows the order and substance of Mk. 4. Where Mark has the Parable of the Secretly Growing Seed, Matthew substitutes the Wheat and the Tares. For a discussion of the issue see Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 130; T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1949), pp. 192, 193; C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1909), II, 639-41. However, Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, pp. 155-57, maintains the authenticity of Mt. 13:24-30 as an eschatological parable of Jesus. If the variants of Saying 59 were of a different nature from what they actually are, the saying might represent a preliminary stage in the alteration of Mk. 4:26-29, prior to the form in which it exists in Mt. 13:24-30. Nevertheless, as the above discussion demonstrates, Saying 59 must be an abridgment of Matthew's version of the parable.

Bultmann describes the form of Mt. 13:24-30 as "reine Erzaehlung . . . ."[1] Saying 59 is not a "clear narration." Its changed emphasis implies a meaning not altogether clear in the context of the *Gospel of Thomas*. Thus it is secondary in nature.

(3) Saying 100	Mt. 12:46-50	Mk. 3:31-5	Lk. 8:19-21
	[46] Ἔτι αὐτοῦ		
	λαλοῦντος τοῖς		
	ὄχλοις, ἰδοὺ	[31] καὶ ἔρχονται	[19] Παρεγένετο δὲ
	ἡ μήτηρ καὶ	ἡ μήτηρ αὐ-	πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ
	οἱ ἀδελφοὶ	τοῦ καὶ οἱ	μήτηρ καὶ οἱ
	αὐτοῦ ειστή-	ἀδελφοὶ αὐ-	ἀδελφοὶ αὐ-
	κεισαν ἔξω	τοῦ, καὶ ἔξω	τοῦ, καὶ οὐκ
	ζητοῦντες	στήκοντες	ἠδύναντο συν-
	αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι	ἀπέστειλαν	τυχεῖν αὐτῷ
		πρὸς αὐτὸν	διὰ τὸν
		καλοῦντες	ὄχλον.
		αὐτόν.	
[21] ΠΕϪΕ M̄ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ	[47] εἶπεν δέ τις	[32] καὶ ἐκάθητο	ἀπηγγέλη δὲ
ΝΑϤ ϪΕ	αὐτῷ·	περὶ αὐτὸν	αὐτῷ
		ὄχλος, καὶ	
		λέγουσιν	
		αὐτῷ·	ὅτι·
ΝΕΚΣΝΗΥ [22] ΜΝ̄ΤΕΚ-	ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ	ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ	ἡ μήτηρ

---

[1] Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

ΜΑΑΥ	σου καὶ οἱ	σου καὶ οἱ	σου καὶ οἱ
	ἀδελφοί σου	ἀδελφοί σου	ἀδελφοί σου
ΣΕΑϨΕΡΑΤΟΥ ϨΙ	ἔξω ἑστήκασιν	καὶ αἱ ἀδελ-	ἑστήκασιν
23 ΠΣΑ Ν̄ΒΟΛ	ζητοῦντές σοι	φαί σου ἔξω	ἔξω ἰδεῖν σε
	λαλῆσαι.[1]	ζητοῦσίν σε.	θέλοντες.
ΠΕϪΑϤ ΝΑΥ ϪΕ	48 ὁ δὲ ἀποκρι-	33 καὶ ἀποκρι-	
	θεὶς εἶπεν τῷ	θεὶς αὐτοῖς	
	λέγοντι αὐτῷ·	λέγει·	
	τίς ἐστιν ἡ	τίς ἐστιν ἡ	
	μήτηρ μου,	μήτηρ μου	
	καὶ τίνες εἰ-	καὶ	
	σὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί	οἱ ἀδελφοί	
	μου;	μου;	
	49 καὶ ἐκτείνας	34 καὶ περι-	21 ὁ δὲ ἀποκρι-
	τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ	βλεψάμενος	θεὶς
	τοὺς μαθητὰς	τοὺς περὶ	
	αὐτοῦ εἶπεν·	αὐτὸν κύκλῳ	εἶπεν πρὸς
		καθημένους	αὐτούς·
		λέγει·	
ΝΕΤΝ̄ΝΕΕΙΜΑ			μήτηρ μου καὶ
			ἀδελφοί μου
24 ΕϮΡΕ Μ̄ΠΟΥΩϢ	50 ὅστις γὰρ ἂν	ὃς ἂν	οὗτοι εἰσιν
	ποιήσῃ τὸ	ποιήσῃ τὸ	οἱ τὸν λόγον

---

[1] V. 47 is present in C D Θ, the Byzantine text and the majority of the remaining witnesses, lat. It is omitted by ℵ B, a considerable number out of other groups, ff^1 k sy^{sc}.

	θέλημα τοῦ	θέλημα τοῦ	τοῦ θεοῦ
Μ̄ΠΑΕΙΩΤ	πατρός μου	θεοῦ,	ἀκούοντες
	τοῦ ἐν οὐρα-		καὶ
	νοῖς,		ποιοῦντες.
ΝΑΕΙ ΝΕ	αὐτός μου	οὗτος	
25 ΝΑΣΝΗΥ ΜΝ̄	ἀδελφὸς καὶ	ἀδελφός μου	
ΤΑΜΑΑΥ	ἀδελφὴ καὶ	καὶ ἀδελφὴ	
	μήτηρ ἐστίν.	καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.	
26 Ν̄ΤΟΟΥ ΠΕ ΕΤΝΑΒΩΚ			
ΕϨΟΥΝ ΕΤΜΝ̄ΤΕΡΟ			
Μ̄ΠΑΕΙΩΤ[1]			

Certain features which characterize Saying 100 are best explained by direct literary dependence upon the Synoptic Gospels. For example, it seems to be a continuation of the common tendency of Matthew and Luke to abbreviate the narrative of Mark. In the above citations Mark uses by far the greatest number of words, Matthew the next largest number, then Luke. Saying 100 is shortest of all. Still further, we detect the same editorial bent of Matthew to change "the crowd" to "the disciples"; thus, it is the "disciples" who instigate the discourse.[2] The expression "those . . . who do the will of my Father" seems to be an echo of Mt. 12:50, but unlike Matthew, here Jesus does not address Himself mainly to His disciples. According to Saying 100, anyone who does the will of His Father "shall enter the kingdom of my (Jesus') Father." The last addition as the conclusion of the saying contains a trait peculiar to the *Gospel of Thomas*, namely, the phrase "kingdom of my Father" (or "the Father"). This characteristic alone makes the entire utterance suspect as a product of editorial revision.

---

[1] The disciples said to him, "Your brothers and your mother are standing outside." He said to them, "Those who are in this place (lit., "these places") who do the will of my Father, these are my brothers and my mother. They are the ones who shall enter the kingdom of my Father."

[2] Outside of the standard formula "Jesus said," the majority of the sayings in the collection are introduced by "the disciples."

It is more than probable that Saying 100 was adapted from the Synoptic Gospels to reinforce the collection's teaching upon the significance (or insignificance) of human relationships, particularly as such pertained to marriage and the family. We have already seen the aspersions cast upon male-female relations and the encouragement of sexual asceticism.[1] In the present instance, disregard for family ties is enjoined, and it is to be inferred that doing the will of the Father means the "solitariness" of sexual asceticism. This is what is required before one may "enter the kingdom."[2]

Theological alterations of canonical sayings.--There are numerous cases of tendentious expansions or modifications of New Testament sayings in the *Gospel of Thomas*.[3] Saying 45

---

[1] See above, chap. iii, pp.107-10, and Appendix B on μοναχός. See also Sayings 10, 16, 21, 23, 38, 50, 51, 63, 77, 115.

[2] *Ibid*., and esp. Sayings 16, 23, 51, 77.

[3] This group is more numerous than any of the pre-

(on blasphemy)[1] is changed to include all three persons of the Trinity, whereas Mark mentions only the Holy Spirit, and Matthew and Luke only the Son of Man and the Holy Spirit. This is apparently a reflection of Trinitarian interests in the early church. We are safe in the assumption that Saying 45, with its trinitarian formula, probably was included in the earliest form of the collection. We have observed in Chapter II that _Thomas_ seems to have been revised from a more to a less orthodox version. Saying 45 seems to be a remnant of the earlier form. We make this assertion because elsewhere the work shows no interest in the trinity, which seems to have been purely incidental to its primary theological interests.

Saying 66 (the Parable of the Great Supper)[2] has several variants from the Synoptic version, but the most significant one is the concluding statement which gives the application of

---

ceding. This is a significant fact in that it aids us in interpreting the attitude of the community toward the New Testament. It further assists us in formulating a systematic exposition of the theology of _Thomas_ (see below, chaps. v and vi). In addition to the ones discussed above the following fit the same classification: Sayings 20, 31, 37, 47, 50, 60, 63, 64b, 66, 70, 71, 72, 73, 77, 80, 88, 93, 96, 100, 101, 102, 107, 108, 110, 114. These alterations of canonical data to suit the theological views of the Gnostic community show that, where _Thomas_ uses the New Testament, it does not hesitate in framing such alterations. At the same time the compiler(s) wished to give the sayings a ring of authenticity by preserving the Semitic parallelism or the Synoptic style and by using terms and concepts that appear in the New Testament.

[1] Cf. Mt. 12:31-32 // Mk. 3:28-29 // Lk. 12:10.

[2] Cf. Mt. 22:2-14 // Lk. 14:16-24.

the parable: "The buyers and mer[chants shall not enter] into the places of my Father." This turn strongly emphasizes the collection's antipathy for all worldly concerns, and in conjunction with Saying 96's dictum against lending money for interest, especially condemns economic concerns.

Saying 81 transposes a saying from the passion narrative[1] and gives a different flavor to it and the verses to which it is joined.[2] The resultant version which follows shows that the two passages lifted from Luke almost verbatim are used to reinforce the sexual-ascetic views of the group that employed the collection:

> A woman from the crowd said to him, "Blesse[d is the] womb which bore you and the [breas]ts which nourished you!" He said to her, "Blessed are those who have heard the word of the Father and keep it in truth! For the days will come when you will say, 'Blessed is the womb which has not conceived and the breasts which have given no milk!'"

Saying 101 (on paying taxes to Caesar)[3] is another example of the same tendency. The vividness of the dialogue between Jesus and His questioners in the Synoptic account is cut away by the compiler. The element of conflict between Jesus and his opponents is entirely lacking in the Coptic version, which shows a lack of interest in the historical narrative of the Synoptics. There is agreement with the

---

[1] Lk. 23:29.

[2] Lk. 11:27-28.

[3] Cf. Mt. 22:15-22 // Mk. 12:13-17 // Lk. 20:20-26.

Synoptics in the wording "Give what belongs to Caesar to Caesar; give what belongs to God to God," but the new addition is included to emphasize the importance of Jesus: "what is mine give it to me!" There is an orderly progression from the things of least importance to those of greatest importance.[1]

Saying 108 (the Parable of the Lost Sheep)[2] displays a significant alteration. The version in the Gospel of Thomas is shorter than that of Luke and seems closer to that of Matthew, but the meaning of the parable is different from either Matthew or Luke. Saying 108 describes the lost sheep as "the largest," while in Matthew and Luke it is simply one of the hundred. The designation of the lost sheep as "the largest" is extremely important. It is conceivable that it is thus related to the strange treatment of the same parable in the Gospel of Truth, where a peculiar method of counting by the position of the fingers on the hands is referred to.[3]

---

[1] However, it is not necessary to assume that this places God in an inferior position to Jesus, as Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 189, assume. They connect this with the "three gods" of Saying 31, which they take as an implied criticism of the doctrine of the Trinity. Since their reasoning is based upon a faulty translation, it cannot be valid.

[2] Cf. Lk. 15:4-7 // Mt. 18:12-13.

[3] Of this strange method of interpretation in 32:4-17, Grobel, op. cit., pp. 129, 131, says that it "rests upon a folk custom, once universal in Latin-speaking lands, of counting on the fingers--not the naive one-to-ten finger counting of the primitives and of small children, but an ingenious system by which the two hands at rest (i.e. without making any second or third gesture) could indicate to a single glance any number from 1 to 9,999! The units were made by nine positions of the little finger and the two adjacent fingers of

All the numbers from 1 to 99 are counted on the left hand (which represents the evil side), and consequently "the one sheep" which brings completion and transfers the process to the right hand (which represents the good side) is "the largest" (or "the greatest") of them all! If this interpretation is correct, it would explain how or why the compiler took his cue from Matthew's statement (18:13) that the shepherd "rejoices over it more than over the ninety-nine" and changed it to "'I (the shepherd) love you more than the ninety-nine.'" The one sheep which is found by the shepherd is "the largest" (or "greatest") because, as a symbol of the complete number 100 which is made by a gesture of the good right hand alone, it "signifies God" who is "all perfection . . . . He is the antithesis of all lack, though it be but the lack of the number one; he is the seat of all good, the antithesis of the threatening left hand."[1]

---

the right hand. Hence the greatest shift in the whole system lay between ninety-nine and one hundred. In no other case could the addition or subtraction of a mere one change the whole digital gesture from one hand to the other. But by a tradition from very ancient superstition the left hand was 'sinister,' the right hand favorable, not merely in the minds of Gnostics but in those of all Greeks and Romans and of most peoples . . . . Beda . . . explained the whole system in De loquela per gestum digitorum et temporum ratione libellus and recognized that Jerome in his commentary on Matt. 13 had used this system in just as strange a way to 'explain' the numbers one hundred, sixty, and thirty. On the whole subject fascinating details are offered by Karl Menninger, Zahlwort und Ziffer, pp. 140ff."

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 133.

The Use and Interpretation of New Parables and Sayings[1]

New parables.--Three hiterto unknown parables merit some attention. There are no canonical parallels to this new material which has come to light for the first time in the Gospel of Thomas. Saying 7, the Wise Fisherman Parable, is the first of the three:

> And he said, "Man is like a wise fisherman: he (lit., "this one") cast his net into the sea (and) drew it up out of the sea full of little fish. Among them the wise fisherman found a large, good fish. He threw all the little fish down into the sea: he chose the large fish without trouble. He who has ear to hear, let him hear!"

The description of the fisherman as "wise" reminds us of Saying 78 (see above) in which the merchant who brought the "single pearl" is called "wise." This fits in with the collection's emphasis upon "know" and "knowledge."[2] The parable may have had a christological meaning. It is striking that it is not a parable of "the kingdom" or "the kingdom of the Father." The center of attention is on "Man," who may be the equivalent of "Son of Man," or Jesus, and on His choosing the "large fish." The meaning may be that the "large fish" is the Gnostic man, who alone is chosen by God or Jesus.

A second important new parable is that of the Woman with the Jar of Flour, Saying 98 (97:7-15):

---

[1] Other than those discussed here, the following merit special attention in a detailed commentary: Sayings 26, 28, 51, 53, 83, 84, 90, 103, 105, 106.

[2] See below, chap. v, "Gnostic Terms and Symbols."

> Jesus said, "The kingdom of the Fa[ther is] like a woman carrying a j[ar] full of flour. As she walked [along a] distant road, the handle of the ja[r] broke (and) the flour poured out behind [her onto] the road. (But) she did not know it; she was unaware of trouble. After she had gone into her house, she put the jar down (and) found it empty!"

There are two clues relative to the meaning of the parable. The first is the prevalent emphasis throughout the *Gospel of Thomas* on the importance of "knowing" and the possession of "knowledge." The second is the presence in the parable of an important sentence with two key words at the critical juncture in the story when the flour was lost. In 97:12 occur the verbs **ΣOOYN**and **EIME**, synonyms meaning "to know."[1] The same idea is given in parallel: (1) "She did not *know* it; (2) she was *unaware* (ignorant) of trouble." We conclude, therefore, that the emphasis of the parable cannot be upon the peril that may exist at the *eschaton*, but upon the tragedy of *not knowing* what is being lost until it is too late.

The third parable is the Man with the Sword, Saying 99 (97:15-20):

> Jesus said, "The kingdom of the Father is like a man who wished to kill an important man. He drew forth his sword in his house (and) caused it to pierce the wall, that he might know whether his hand would be strong enough. Then he slew the important man."

In some respects this parable is similar to what we find in Lk. 14:28-32, where the cost of discipleship is presented by the stories of the man building the tower and the king waging war against his enemy. In both instances there is an attempt to determine whether the project can be carried through to completion. Here, if the man is strong enough, he will kill the μεγιστᾶνος. Saying 80 indicates considerable contempt on the part of the *Gospel of Thomas* for "kings and . . . great men" (ΜΕΓΙΣΤΑΝΟΣ), for "they [will not be able] to discern the truth." The implication is that the Gnostic man, who has rejected the "soft," materialistic, and sensuous life of the "great men," *will* know the truth. Now in Saying 99 the verb ΕΙΜΕ occurs (97:19), as it does in Saying 98. Once more could not the emphasis be on "knowing or understanding" the extent of one's strength? There may be a veiled meaning behind the term μεγιστᾶνος in Saying 99. Grant and Freedman suggest that it probably means "the world."[1] If not this, then perhaps all things connected with a worldly existence.

---

[1] Crum, *Dictionary*, pp. 370 and 77 respectively.

New Sayings.--There are many new sayings in the *Gospel of Thomas*, sayings previously unknown in the main, which are similar either to Synoptic or Johannine sayings.[2] Those of the Synoptic type are much more numerous, of course not including the more thoroughly gnosticized sayings. Only representative examples of the Synoptic type will be discussed here since our purpose is not to give a complete commentary but to show the general scope and tendency of the collection.[1]

---

[1] *Op. cit*., p. 188.

[2] We cannot always clearly separate Johannine and Synoptic-type utterances. There are occasions wherein the similarities are so close that it is hazardous to attempt a distinction. In the above analysis we mean by Synoptic-type those sayings that are generally characterized by poetic parallelism and are pithy and epigrammatic in nature. By Johannine we mean those that seem nearest to the Fourth Gospel in theology and prolixity of style.

Saying 6 should be considered first:

> Jesus said,
> "Blessed is this lion which the man will eat,
> and the lion will become man;
> and polluted (hated?) is this man whom the lion will eat,
> and the lion will become man."

We are at once impressed by the parallelism of members, but the symbolism of the words is so obscure that one hesitates to interpret the saying. Nevertheless, we may have a clue in the notice of Hippolytus that the Naassenes considered the lion to be a symbol of sexual desire.[2] If the connections with this group are as pronounced as they seem to be, the meaning of Saying 6 is made clearer. Even apart from the reference in Hippolytus there is evidence that the sexual views of the document lie behind this saying.[3] It is significant that the verb **BΩTE**, "pollute, befoul," is used in the second half of the saying to describe the state of the man devoured by "the lion." **BΩTE** occurs in the Old Testament in the contexts of sexual perversion, sexual defilement, and adultery.[1] This does not prove that the same connotation of sexual involvement is indicated in Saying 6, but the fact that the Coptic verb frequently translated Greek verbs having to do with sexual relations of some sort suggests a similar context in Saying 6. Hence, we venture a paraphrase of the saying:

---

[1] Saying 29 is the chief example of the Johannine type. See below, chap. v, p. 215. Elsewhere we have only echoes of Johannine literature, as in Sayings 18, 25, 39, 109.

[2] _Ref_. V. 3.

[3] Crum, _Dictionary_, p. 456. See also Sayings 21, 23, 38, 63, 115.

> "Blessed is the man who conquers sexual desire, and thus assimilates it to his nature; polluted is the man who is consumed by sexual desire, to the extent that he personifies this passion."[2]

Saying 17 (84:5-9)	I Cor. 2:9
[5]ΠΕϪΕ Ι̅Σ̅ ϪΕ	καθὼς γέγραπται·
ϮΝΑϮ ΝΗΤΝ̅ Μ̅ΠΕΤΕ[6]Μ̅ΠΕΒΑΛ	ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ
ΝΑΥ ΕΡΟϤ ΑΥΩ	
ΠΕΤΕΜ̅ΠΕΜΑΑ[7]ϪΕ ΣΟΤΜΕϤ·	οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν
ΑΥΩ ΠΕΤΕΜ̅ΠΕϬΙϪ	καὶ
Ϭ[8]Μ̅ϬΩΜϤ̅· ΑΥΩ Μ̅ΠΕϤΕΙ	ἐπὶ καρδίαν
ΕϨΡΑΪ ϨΙ ΦΗΤ̀ [9]Ρ̅ΡΩΜΕ[3]	ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη,

---

[1] *Ibid.*, on Lev. 18:25; 21:7; Ezek. 23:38; Hos. 9:10.

[2] Grant and Freedman, *op. cit.*, p. 126, give a different interpretation: "From other sayings in Thomas we may infer that the lion can be eaten only if it is killed and becomes a corpse (60), and that knowing the world is equivalent to finding a corpse (57)--the world is not worthy of those who find such a corpse. The Gnostic who has eaten what is dead has made it living (Saying 10). Therefore, by eating the dead lion, which may be the hostile world (cf., I Peter 5:8: 'Your adversary the devil, like a raging lion . . .'), you can overcome the world by assimilating it to yourself. If the true inner man is consumed by the lion, and the lion becomes man, the world has overcome the Gnostic . . . ."

[3] Jesus said, "I shall give you what no eye has seen and what no ear has heard and what no hand has touched and what has not entered into the heart of man."

ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς
τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

This saying presents several problems. The Pauline version seems related to Isa. 64:4; 65:17, but it is obviously not a direct quotation. The formula καθὼς γέγραπται is common in the citation of passages from the Old Testament. Pierre Prigent has examined the various citations of this passage in early Christian and rabbinic literature. He concludes: (1) That it was derived from Isa. 64:4; (2) That it originated prior to Paul; (3) That its "Sitz im Leben" is a liturgical one, first in the synagogue, then in the church's celebration of the eucharist.[1] He believes that the eucharistic background was known by the "author" of the *Gospel of Thomas*. Prigent says, "Or dans ce sacrement c'est Christ que donne et est donne d'ou l'addition introductive: Je vous donnerai."[2] While not passing upon the accuracy or inaccuracy of Prigent's judgment, we may add that even if the compiler knew of the saying having a eucharistic background, he has given it a new turn by adding "what no hand has touched." And with this addition the saying is given a Gnostic perspective:

> The joys of the kingdom are completely unrelated to sense perception . . . . His phrasing of this saying is the exact reverse of I John 1:1, which speaks of

---

[1] "Ce que l'oeil n'a pas vu, I Cor. 2, 9," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XIV (November-December, 1958), 416-429.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 429.

> "What we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we beheld and our hands handled."[1]

Saying 54 is important for its possible allusion to the Old Testament or to the Hebrew prophets:

> His disciples said to him, "Twenty-four prophets have spoken in Israel and they have all spoken concerning you." He said to them, "You have abandoned (forsaken?) the Living One who is before you, and you have spoken of those who are dead."

The "twenty-four prophets" may be the equivalent of the books of the Old Testament;[2] that is, unless this is an allusion to twenty-four prophetic personalities according to a method of reckoning that is unknown to us. The first of the two alternatives seems more likely in that no references to the Old Testament occur in the Gospel of Thomas and Jewish customs are neither abruptly thrust aside or spiritualized. Hence it would be logical to expect a statement showing contempt for the Old Testament.[3] If the saying does not represent a Marcionite tendency, it is rather close to it.[1]

---

[1] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 137.

[2] Counting as follows: five books of the Law; eight prophets (=four Former Prophets and four Latter Prophets, Isa. Jer., Ezek., Bk. of the Twelve); eleven Hagiographa (Chron. as one, Ezra-Neh. as one, Job, Ps., Prov., Eccles., S. of Sol., Ruth, Esther, Lam., Dan.) = twenty-four. On this see b. Baba Bathra 14^b in The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I. Epstein (London: Soncino Press, 1935), III, 69-71, and Numbers Rabbah XIV. 18, in Midrash Rabbah, ed. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon (London: Soncino Press, 1939), VI, 630. Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 162, take this as referring to the twenty-three prophets mentioned in the old Jewish Lives of the Prophets, plus John the Baptist, making twenty-four.

[3] The statement of the disciples in No. 54 seems to be based on Jn. 5:39-40: "You search the scriptures because you think you have eternal life in them; and those are the ones which testify concerning me; and you do not desire to come to me that you may have life." See also Jn. 8:53: "Are you greater than . . . the prophets who died?" and Lk. 24:5: "Why are you seeking the Living One among the dead?"

We conclude this section with a brief treatment of Saying 55:

> His disciples said to him, "Is circumcision of benefit or not?" He said to them, "If it had been of benefit their father would have begotten them from their mother (already) circumcised, but the true circumcision in Spirit has found complete benefit."

This saying recalls: (1) Ro. 2:25a: περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς (2) Ro. 3:1b: τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια τῆς περιτομῆς; and (3) Ro. 2:29b: περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι. No. 55 bears the marks of dependence upon these passages from Romans. There is no evidence whatever that Paul is citing a well-known saying in Romans 2 and 3, and in view of the tendency of the *Gospel of Thomas* to spiritualize Jewish observances, the saying must be an invention fashioned to justify the beliefs of the group.[2] There would have been no occasion for the composition of a saying of this type (along with Nos. 5, 13, 14, 28, 105) except in an environment where Jewish customs were a problem for at least some of the members of the community. This fact strengthens the probability of contact with Jews or Jewish-Christians somewhere along the line in the compilation and/or revision of the Gospel of Thomas. As shown here and elsewhere in the collection the reaction to such contact was a negative one.

---

[1] Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, p. 74, says: "Somewhere about 420 St Augustine came across an anonymous Marcionite pamphlet as he was walking along the sea street at Carthage. On reading it, he felt impelled to compose a reply which he entitled *Against the Adversary of the Law and the Prophets*. In it he relates that 'When the apostles (so he said) asked the Lord what they were to think of the Jewish prophets, who, as was supposed, announced his coming as having already taken place at some date in the past, our Lord was troubled that they even yet had such thoughts, and answered: "*Ye have rejected the Living One who is before your eyes, and talk idly of the dead*."'"

[2] Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909-38), refers to traditions of various individuals being born with the sign of the covenant: Seth, I, 121; Noah, I, 146, 147; Jacob, I, 315; Gad, I, 365; Joseph, II, 4; Jeremiah, IV, 294; Adam was born with the sign of the covenant and sinned by removing it, V, 100, 268, 273; Moses, V, 399; David, VI, 247, 248.

Summary and Conclusion

With regard to the sayings that are self-evidently parallels to canonical sayings, we have examined this group in relation to six subheads. The footnotes contain further examples of each of the six types, some of which fall into more than one category. Out of a total of twenty-two sayings examined in detail, only two (Sayings 35 and 56) have traits which could be evidence of a very early tradition, possibly independent of and/or antecedent to the Synoptic Gospels. Saying 36 may also be of the same order as 35 and 56, although it is somewhat less probable. We should add that from the large number of sayings remaining, of which only representative examples have been studied in this chapter, there may be found a few that represent a tradition parallel to the Synoptic Gospels or even prior to them. At the present stage of research, however, the evidence strongly favors the view that the overwhelming majority of these sayings, if not all of them, are secondary to the canonical text. We have seen again and again clear examples of dependence upon the Synoptic Gospels. A similar study needs to be done upon the sayings not analyzed here in order to test our present generalizations.

It is of extreme importance that we observe another fact. In the use of canonical sayings there are numerous instances of theologically tendentious alterations. This renders highly unlikely the possibility that very ancient sayings traditions may be preserved in the collection. It also amplifies the Gnostic character of the sayings as a whole. The skillful way in which some of the sayings are put together must not sidetrack the careful analyst who should see beneath these formulations subtle theological motifs. The superficial reader may not detect these themes, but they are there, nevertheless. In spite of the surface appearance of disorder in the arrangement of the sayings we may still detect currents of thought which dominate the entire collection and determine the way in which most of the sayings are to be interpreted.

The same thing applies to the new parables and sayings, which bear a Semitic or a Synoptic stamp, but which are not among those credited to Jesus in the New Testament. Here again a painstaking analysis rewards the critic with a better grasp of the theology of the Gospel of Thomas and the beliefs of the Gnostic community. These sayings are most likely the product of a people outside the mainstream of orthodox Christianity, or at the very least on the border line leaning far toward "the left."

Having thus established in this chapter and the preceding one something of the stance of the collection as a whole and of the community in which it originated and/or was used, we move on to a more detailed exposition of the dominant ideas and the ruling theological perspective of *Thomas*. Our objective is to understand the document as well as we can. While there are many things that will be made clear only after painstaking research upon each saying in the collection, we may yet obtain an overall view which will remain valid in the future.

PART III. RELATION TO GNOSTICISM

CHAPTER V

GNOSTIC TERMS AND SYMBOLS

Introduction

Hitherto we have engaged in a historical, literary, and form-critical analysis of the sayings in our collection. By this means we have established that the materials in the Gospel of Thomas are representative of a group outside the orthodox Christianity of the second and third centuries. We have found very little that has direct bearing upon New Testament studies, including the problem of Gospel origins. We look in vain for any new insights concerning the historical Jesus, nor do we hear but occasional echoes of His authentic voice. What we have found are a few traces of the so-called "Western Text," but this is subsidiary to the evidence uncovered with regard to the Gnostic or gnosticizing tendency of the sayings. Since we must try to comprehend the teaching of Thomas as the document itself was intended to be understood, we must look yet further for any guideposts that may clarify the problem and thus enable us to frame out of the seeming disarray a systematic presentation of the theology in the work. Before such a systematization can be done we must first examine the collection from the standpoint of the terms and symbols found there that are held in common with Gnosticism.

Since no Gnostic myths are to be found in the sayings, we have to search for suggestions of a mythical background or for indications of a basic Gnostic point of view. We shall find that there are allusions that may best be explained by a Gnostic ontology lying at the base of them. Concerning method our approach first involves a study of the terms that describe the experience of the Gnostic man as he is brought out of a-gnostic existence, and then of the terms which reveal a dualistic worldview. Finally, but not of least importance, we shall analyze the extensive use of Gnosis (=ΣOOYN) and related terms. The central place of the concept of Gnosis should be noted.

From "Ignorance" to "Knowledge"

Drunkenness.--We do not find an extensive use of this term in our collection, but its occurrence is of such a nature that it is significant. The symbol is used in various Gnostic writings to express the condition of the a-gnostic man, the man who is involved in "illusory existence." In Corpus Hermeticum VII. 1, we read of τὸν τῆς ἀγνωσία ἄκρατον.[1] We have already touched upon the same figure as it occurs in the Gospel of Truth.[2] But not only do we find the negative state of "ignorance" characterized by "drunkenness;" there is also a paradoxical employment of the same term to define the bliss of the Gnostic! In the Odes of Solomon there is the following statement:

---

[1] Nock and Festugiere, op. cit., I, 81.

[2] 22:16-20; Grobel, op. cit., p. 78. See above, chap. iii, p.129.

> From the Lord's spring came speaking water in abundance to my lips. I drank and was drunken with the water of everlasting life, yet my drunkenness was not that of ignorance, but I turned away from vanity.[1]

Precisely the same symbol with a dual usage is found in the Gospel of Thomas. In Saying 29, where Jesus is represented as having appeared to men "in flesh," he is made to say that he found all of them "drunken." They do not desire to drink (and apparently become drunk) with what will release them. They will continue in their state of ignorance until they "cast off their wine" (throw off the effects of their wine?) and "repent." Here there is the obvious use of the term to describe the a-gnostic man, and it is implied in the expression "I found no one among them who was thirsty, . . ." The meaning must be that if the men will drink what Jesus offers, they shall be intoxicated with the "water of life."[2] Turning back to Saying 12, we find the symbol clearly applied to the "drunkenness" of the Gnostic. Saying 12 is roughly analogous to the Synoptic version of the "Great Confession at Caesarea Philippi," and without a doubt is based upon it.[3] In the version of the Gospel of Thomas there are three disciples who reply to Jesus when he says, "Compare me and tell me what I am like." In turn Simon Peter, Matthew, and Thomas speak; the first two are passed over in silence after they make their remarks, but of Thomas Jesus says, "you have drunk and become drunk from the bubbling well (?) which I came and dug (?)." Notice that the phrase "have drunk and become drunk" is rather close to the expression in the Odes of Solomon just cited. Thus we have positive evidence of a typical Gnostic symbol used very pointedly to describe the a-gnostic man but also employed to emphasize the happy condition of the man who has drunk deeply of the "well which (Jesus) . . . dug."[1]

---

[1] Quoted in Jonas, Gnostic Religion, p. 71; see also Jonas, Gnosis and spaetantiker Geist, I, 116, note 1, and 117 (use of the symbol in Mandaean literature).

[2] Jn. 7:37-39.

[3] Mt. 16:13-23 // Mk. 8:27-33 // Lk. 9:18-22.

Sleep.--A closely related symbol in Gnostic literature is that of "sleep." Once again the Gospel of Truth provides a perfect example of the use of the symbol. At the conclusion of the section on "Illusory Existence," the Father (presumably) expresses himself as wishing that the a-gnostic think of himself as follows: "I have been like the shadows and fantasies of the night!"[2] There immediately follows "The Nightmare

---

[1] Cf. Jn. 4:1-15; 7:37-39.

[2] 28:26-28; Grobel, op. cit., pp. 114, 116. See also Nock and Festugiere, op. cit., I, 16, and above, chap. iii, p. , note 1. Jonas, Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist, I, 114, gives this further example: "'Denn die Welt hat sie (die Seele) ueberlistet, ueberlistet die Gottheit in ihr' (G 393). 'Sie mischten mir Trank mit ihren Listen und gaben mir zu kosten ihre Speise; ich vergass, dass ich ein Koenigssohn war und diente ihrem Koenig. Ich vergass die Perle, nach der mich meine Eltern geschickt hatten. Durch die Schwere ihrer Nahrung sank ich in tiefen Schlaf' (Seelenhymnus der Thomasakten)."

Parable" which describes the terrors of the man involved in "sleep" and "illusory existence."[1] In the *Gospel of Thomas* the symbol as such does not occur, but in Saying 22 the "master of the house," if he "knows that the thief is coming, he will be *awake* before he comes . . . ." Then is interspersed a word of warning: "you be *awake* before (watch out for?)[2] the world." There is not an overt usage of the symbol here or elsewhere in the collection. "Sleep" may be an eschatological figure of speech as in the Synoptic passages from which Saying 22 is drawn.[3] The symbol does not appear to be used in the same sense as in the *Gospel of Truth* to describe "illusory existence;" yet, at the same time it is suggested that the great peril of man is that he "fall asleep" before the world, not being aware of its illusions and the peril which the "robbers" (Archons?) bring as they would "come upon" man and overpower him. With regard to the eschatological aspect of the saying, or the lack of it, the following comment is appropriate:

> Jesus tells the disciples a parable found in Luke 12:39 and Matthew 24:43 . . . . As in Matthew 24:42, an admonition to 'watch' is combined with the parable.

---

[1] Grobel, *op. cit*., pp. 116, 118.

[2] POEIΣ translates γρηγορεῖν, "be awake, watchful," ἀγρυπνεῖν, "be wakeful, lie awake," φυλάσσειν, watch, be sleepless, guard," τηρεῖν, "keep, guard." Crum, *Dictionary*, pp. 300, 301.

[3] Mt. 24:43-44 // Lk. 12:39-40; Lk. 12:35, 37; cf. Mk. 13:32-37; Rev. 3:2. See also I Thess. 5:1-10 for Paul's use of the word in an eschatological setting. In both the Synoptics and Paul the reference is to the *parousia* of the Son of Man.

> Thomas has changed its meaning, however. In the gospels the parable pointed toward the future coming of the kingdom; Thomas deletes the words "at what hour." He introduces a static, Gnostic conception by identifying the "house" with the "kingdom," and states that the watchfulness is to be "over against the world."[1]

Of course, this is in line with the "realized eschatology" of Thomas.[2] Consequently, while the symbol of "sleep" may not be as clearly utilized as elsewhere in Gnostic literature, it certainly is not eschatological as in the New Testament.[3] Saying 22 warns against the peril of "falling asleep" in one's confrontation of the world; to do so is to court the disaster of "existence-in-poverty."[4]

Awakening.--In connection with "drunkenness" and "sleep" there is a related imagery depicting the shock and terror that one experiences upon being roused from the stupor of a-gnostic existence. Jonas quotes a passage from the Manichaean cosmogony given by Theodore bar Konai (wrote at the end of the eighth century),[5] where "Jesus the Luminous" rouses Adam "from the sleep of death." Adam responds in the following way:

---

[1] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 142.

[2] Below, chap. vi, pp. 247-49 .

[3] There seems to be an echo of Gnostic usage of the term "sleep" in Eph. 5:14: "Awake, O sleeper, and rise from the dead, and Christ shall give you light." There is no pronounced eschatological emphasis in Ephesians. See Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, trans. Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), I, 175, and Jonas, Gnostic Religion, p. 85, and Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist, I, 133.

[4] Saying 2.

[5] For a summary of Theodore bar Konai's contributions to our knowledge of various Gnostic sects, see Doresse, The Secret Books . . . , pp. 55-61, 158, 186, 205, 213, 217, 250.

> Then Adam cried and lamented: terribly he raised his voice like a roaring lion, tore [his dress], smote his breast, and spoke: "Woe, woe unto the shaper of my body, unto those who fettered my soul, and unto the rebels that enslaved me!"[1]

The notion is that in his state of "not-knowing" man is unaware of his true condition and thus does not care, but upon receiving the enlightenment of Gnosis, he is stricken with the awful realization that all along he has been held a prisoner in foul matter and has been subject to hostile forces that would keep him a slave and prevent his return to the celestial light. In attenuated form the same idea is present in Saying 1, only here the process is one of "seeking and finding" the "interpretation" of the "words" of "the living Jesus," rather than that of being aroused out of "sleep" or "drunkenness" by a heavenly Messenger. Nevertheless, the end result is the same, for he who "finds . . . will be disturbed."[2] Agitation and disquietude characterize the one who discovers the meaning of the words of Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas; this apparently is the first reaction that Gnosis brings. It is obviously not a permanent condition of the Gnostic, although the extended

---

[1] Jonas, Gnostic Religion, pp. 86, 87, and Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist, I, 134-139.

[2] The word in 80:17 is ϣTOPTP̄, "be disturbed, troubled, in haste." Its Greek equivalents suggest "fear, alarm, being thrown into disorder, dismay, agitation, etc."

"repentances" of Pistis Sophia show to what length such laments could be carried in some circles.[1] An element of the same "wonder" is expressed in Saying 30 where Jesus is made to discuss the causal relationship between "spirit" and "flesh." He speaks of "spirit" as "wealth" and "flesh" as "poverty" and says, "I, myself, marvel at this, ho[w this grea]t wealth was put into this poverty."[2] *Thomas* does not stress this element in the recognition of the tragic nature of human existence, but the sense of "wonder" and inner "disturbance," nevertheless, come upon the Gnostic when he sees his true condition.

Evidences of Dualism

Light and Darkness.--In Iranian dualism there were conceived to be two opposing eternal principles, the one good, the other evil, the one "light," the other "darkness."[3] In *Poimandres* there is the implication that the serpentine darkness that ensnared the light particles somehow originated out of the Godhead.[4] No mythical scheme of either sort can be made out in the Gospel of Thomas, but the terms "light" and "darkness" do appear. A "man of light" (or "light-man")[1] is mentioned in Saying 25, and the light within him "illumines the whole world." In Saying 52 the disciples (?) are advised to describe themselves (to the Archons?) as having come "out of the light." In Saying 63 the "celibate" (?) man is described as one who will end his physical existence "in light," while

---

[1] In contrast to the mournful lament, the *Gospel of Truth* views the "awakening" with joy and is thus much closer to the New Testament: "The Gospel of Truth is a joy for them who have received the boon, through the Father of truth . . . ," 16:31-33; Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

[2] See below, pp. 213-15 . cf. II Cor. 8:9. May there be some slight Gnostic connotation in the word "poverty" as applied to Jesus here?

[3] Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, pp. 57, 236-237, and *Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist*, I, 103, 104, 287-293.

[4] Nock and Festugiere, *op. cit.*, I, 4, 7, 8. This is the opinion of Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, pp. 170-73, and *Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist*, I, 347. His argument is convincing. The view of Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-15, is somewhat different.

While admitting that the "darkness" came onto the scene after the "light," Dodd neglects to develop this point. Instead he draws a parallel with the account of creation in Genesis 1 and emends a doubtful reading in the text of Poimandres, par. 4, descriptive of the "darkness" (σϰολιῶς πεπειραμένον into σϰ. πεπειρασμένον). He then comments: "If this reading be accepted, then Poimandres and Genesis are found to agree in emphasizing the point that the first stage in actual creation is the separation of light and darkness; though in Poimandres the separation takes place through the appearance of a delimited darkness in the field of hitherto un-delimited light, whereas in Genesis it takes place through the dawn of light upon a chaos of darkness. According to both writings the dark ocean remains, delimited from the sphere of light, to be the object of further creative work" (p. 114). As this comment shows, Dodd emphasizes the points of contact with the Biblical story of creation but fails to state whether the "darkness" originated out of the "light" or was eternally co-existent with it. He simply makes it equivalent to the primeval chaos of Genesis 1 which was the substance from which the Creator fashioned the world. Quite illuminating on this point is par. 8 of Poimandres, in which the recipient of the vision asks whence came "the elements of nature." To this the answer comes, "Ἐϰ βουλῆς θεοῦ." Jonas tentatively asserts that this feminine principle (βουλή) is akin to the Sophia of Syrian Gnosis. Sophia's fall, of course, resulted in an abortive offspring who fashioned the material world in ignorance. If Jonas is correct, then the "darkness" of Poimandres has its ultimate origin in the Deity.

[1] This may be paralleled by the rather strange, puzzling reply of Mary to two different statements of Jesus in the Pistis Sophia: "My Lord, my light-man hath ears, and I have understood the whole word which thou hast spoken . . . . My Lord, not only hath my light-man ears, but my soul hath heard and understood all the words which thou sayest." Pistis Sophia, A Gnostic Miscellany, pp. 261, 264.

the man "divided" by marriage (?) will die "in darkness." The number of times that the symbolism appears is certainly limited, but especially the usage of the term "light" in Saying 52 implies a dualistic background.[1]

Life and Death.--These terms are closely related to the preceding ones. We must observe that the mere occurrence of the words is not sufficient to indicate Gnostic dualism. In addition there must be particular connotations given to the terms that will suggest a dualistic world-view. Of general interest here are the Preface, Sayings 3, 18, 19, 60, 61, 112, and 115. Two sayings, 58 and 82, are especially important. In 58 the cosmos is identified as a πτῶμα, "corpse," in 82 as a σῶμα, which may be either a "living" or a "dead body." There is a precedent for calling the cosmos a "body" in Stoicism. The Stoics were absolute materialists and thought of all real entities as material. "Nothing is real that does not occupy space."[2] They drew an analogy between man, who consists of body and soul, and the Universe, which is permeated with the World-Soul or God.[1] Yet, here is no dualism, for

---

[1] One may contend that the appearance of this symbolism is no real indication of a dualistic motif and may point to the Fourth Gospel and other New Testament passages where the same contrasting imagery occurs. However, we should remark that while portions of the New Testament appear consciously anti-gnostic and thereby vitiate a Gnostic perspective on the part of the New Testament, the same cannot be said of Thomas. The collection seems to try to conceal its Gnostic flavor, but it is in no sense anti-gnostic. Especially in Saying 52 does a Gnostic point of view appear to be necessary to explain why and how the term "light" is used.

[2] Vergilius Ferm (ed.), A History of Philosophical Systems (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1950), p. 124.

> Matter is simply one aspect of the first cause, and expresses the passive principle (with nothing derogatory thereby connoted); while the other aspect is the active principle, as reason and will, and this active principle is supreme.[2]

The cosmos, then, may be called a "body" according to the Stoics, but no aspersion is cast upon the physical aspect of existence by the use of the term. To the Stoics the cosmos is perfect, sublime order, and the imitation of the cosmos is the duty of man. This is consistent with a large segment of Greek thought that man is thoroughly at home in the world. The whole scheme of values was inverted by the Gnostics, who set God, the transcendent Being, over against the material world, which is the product of a demonic intelligence. Even the cosmic law and order becomes an expression of the attempt of the lower powers to hold man a prisoner in the material world, since the planets in their orbits are but the hostile Archons who bar the way in man's ascent to the realm of light beyond the material universe. Instead of a pantheistic monism (as in Stoicism) the Gnostics posited a dualistic system in which spirit and matter are utterly dissimilar from and inimical to each other.[3] It is for this reason that Thomas uses not only the ambiguous σῶμα as descriptive of the cosmos, but also the concise word πτῶμα, "corpse." In the view of Thomas the cosmos is altogether worthless. Together with all things material, the contempt with which the cosmos is held in the mind of the group certainly indicates a dualistic perspective in which the "alive" and the "dead" are set in antithetical relation.

---

[1] B. A. G. Fuller, A History of Philosophy (Rev. Ed.; New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1945), I, 253.

[2] William L. Davidson, The Stoic Creed (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907), p. 94.

[3] Jonas, Gnostic Religion, pp. 241-65, and Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist, I, 146-72.

Body, flesh, soul, and spirit.--We have already observed that Sayings 21, 23, 38, 63, 81, and 115 tend to disparage "flesh" and sexual relations between male and female.[1] Saying 15 has a similar bearing on the issue, for by its emphasis upon "Him who was not born of woman" there is an implied criticism of the natural process of procreation. Such a point of view must have proceeded from a basic philosophy which looked down upon the hylic nature of man and the cosmos as inferior and even evil.

Is there any evidence in the Gospel of Thomas for the typical Gnostic psychology whereby man consists of "spirit," "soul," and "flesh" (= "body")?[2] Perhaps once again we should point out that there is no myth in Thomas designed to explain the origin and cause of the nature of man, nor is there a non-mythological exposition of such ideas. The basic conception of man seems to be assumed by the collection. For this reason the sayings which bear upon the subject have to be examined carefully for what they might suggest concerning a possible mythological background or a definite Gnostic psychology.

---

[1] Above, chaps. iii and iv.

[2] Saying 30 proves that "flesh" and "body" are generally synonymous terms in Thomas for the hylic element in man.

The immediate problem raised by the absence of any attempt to explain man's composition has to do with the implications of this missing feature. Several possibilities may be suggested. In the first place the Gnostic character of the anthropology of Thomas may have been purposely obscured in order to make it more acceptable to orthodox Christians. Another possibility would be that an originally more orthodox recension has been revised so as to include basic Gnostic conceptions, while at the same time attempting to preserve the flavor of the original Greek collection. Yet, at least some of the pertinent sayings were included in the earlier editions of Thomas.[1] The net result seems to have been that some earlier editions inconsistently mixed orthodox and heterodox elements which later were more radically smoothed out in the direction of Gnosticism. Some readers may be inclined to regard the absence of an explicit mythological framework as an indication that the collection should be considered to be pre-

---

[1] Half of Saying 29 and the ending of Saying 30 are found in Oxy. Pap. 1. Enough is extant in the Greek text to suggest that these two important sayings may have been in the original collection, although this cannot be established with certainty since both the Coptic and the extant Greek portions of the collection appear to be derived from earlier manuscripts which have had an extensive history of revision. See above, chap. ii, pp. 72, 75.

Gnostic rather than Gnostic in nature. Without going into the problem of what is and what is not Gnostic,[1] the present work has adopted as a working hypothesis the following definition:

> The essence of Gnosticism does not lie in its syncretistic mythology but rather in a new understanding--new in the ancient world--of man and the world; its mythology is only the expression of this understanding. Whereas to ancient man the world had been home--in the Old Testament as God's creation, to classic Greece as the cosmos pervaded by the deity--the utter difference of human existence from all worldly existence was recognized for the first time in Gnosticism and Christianity, and thus the world became foreign soil to the human self; in fact, in Gnosticism, his prison. Gnostic thought is so radical that to it the impulses of one's own senses, instincts, and desires, by which man is bound to the world, appear alien and hostile--hostile to man's real self, which cannot achieve its own nature in this world at all, and to which this world is a prison in which his real self, related to and derived from the world of light, is shackled by the demonic powers of darkness.[2]

According to this definition, therefore, Thomas is certainly a Gnostic work, since it reflects basic Gnostic motifs.[3] Here and there we may find hints of some mythological background to the sayings, but myth per se is not the main thing in Thomas. Instead, the basic world-view is what matters. Consequently, at this point we shall be on the lookout for the terms which indicate a Gnostic psychology.

---

[1] See C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1958), pp. 97-103; R. P. Casey, "The Study of Gnosticism," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVI (1935), 45-60; and Wilson, op. cit., pp. 64-85.

[2] Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 165.

[3] We should add that the above definition has not been adopted arbitrarily. A careful perusal of Thomas convinces one of the accuracy of Bultmann's deductions. Moreover, the fact that the Chenoboskion Gnostics cherished writings including varied and sometimes contradictory mythological formulations confirms the opinion that not merely the myth itself, but the understanding of the world is what distinguishes Gnosticism from other religious perspectives. See Doresse, The Secret Books . . . .

Let us consider, then, the term "spirit" and the sayings in which it appears. In No. 13 the disciples (presumably) are counseled against fasting, prayer, and almsgiving. The saying concludes the third word of warning to the effect that "if you give alms you will do an evil to your spirits" (πνεῦμα).[1] Does the word here indicate the highest element in man, the spark of the divine imprisoned in matter? Saying 13 alone does not indicate this view, but when we consider that none of the sayings ever speaks of "doing evil" to one's "soul" or "body," the likelihood is that we are close to a Gnostic point of view.[2] That is to say, since "doing evil" to one's "spirit" alone is warned against, it is implied that the "spirit" is the one valuable element in man's nature. We move from the realm of probability to relative certainty when we come to Saying 30. Here "flesh" (= "body") is placed at the opposite end of the pole from "spirit." With an attitude of amazement Jesus is made to state positively that "spirit" is "put into" "flesh-body," which is described as "this poverty." We can almost hear the intonation of the Gnostic's voice as he speaks of "flesh-body" as "this poverty," and the clear implication is that "spirit" is imprisoned in "flesh." It should not be forgotten that "spirit" is referred to as ["tḥịs gṛẹa]t wealth" in No. 30. We conclude that we are most likely in

---

[1] It is highly important that only one passage in the New Testament may be considered somewhat analogous to Saying 13 in its mention of "doing evil" to one's πνεῦμα. It is I Cor. 7:1: ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπανγγελίας ἀγαπητοί, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην ἐν φοβῷ θεοῦ.

[2] Wilson, op. cit., pp. 151-52, gives a summary of the creation of man according to the Apocryphon of John, two copies of which are included in the Chenoboskion corpus. This account shows how the light (= spirit) in man came to be imprisoned in the material body: The abortive offspring of the fallen Sophia was Ialdabaoth, the demiurge, who, having seen the reflection of the Father's image in water, resolved with his seven Archons to make man "after the image and likeness of God." Each contributed of his power, but the form was lifeless and inert. By deception Sophia was successful in getting Ialdabaoth to breathe into the face of the creature the power he had inherited from his mother. Sophia desired this to be done in order to recover the power which she had given to Ialdabaoth. The

---

result of Ialdabaoth breathing into Adam this power was that man now became superior to his creators, including Ialdabaoth himself. A struggle for the soul of man ensued between the opposing forces of light and darkness. Ialdabaoth then brought man down to the material world and made a body for him out of its elements. Thus man's true self is in the prison of the body. Valentinian Gnosis distinguished three basic substances in man, spirit, soul, and body (= flesh), in descending order of importance. In Clement of Alexandria's Exc. ex Theod. 54, 56, there is the teaching of the "Eastern" school of Valentinianism to the effect that there are three classes of men, corresponding to the three basic substances: (1) the irrational, who were derived from Cain; (2) the reasonable and just, who came out of Abel; ~~(3)~~ the spiritual, who were born of Seth. The pneumatics are saved by nature. The psychic, or "reasonable and just" men, may by choice be either saved or lost. The irrational, hylic men, in whom there is no trace of spirit or soul, are by nature lost. Concerning this teaching F. Sagnard comments, "Distinction classique valentinienne. Cf. Ir., I, 7, 5 (La gnose val., p. 195) et I, 6, 1 (Ibid., p. 185). La liberté de choix est accordée aux psychiques dans tous les documents. Ainsi Héracléon, Fr. 34/40 (La gnose val., p. 512 et 516). Sur les 'sauves par nature', cf. encore Corp. herm., IX, 5. Cette loi des 'trois substances' est absolue et fondamentale." Clement d'Alexandrie, Extraits de Théodote, ed. and trans. F. Sagnard (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1948), p. 175, note 1. See above, chap. iii, p.126, note 2, for the summary of the myth in Poimandres on this subject.

touch with Gnostic thought-forms concerning the nature of man. Saying 30 indicates the profound tragedy of human existence as consisting in the imprisonment of the divine "spirit" in mundane "flesh."[1]

With regard to the meaning of σῶμα in the Gospel of Thomas, it never indicates the whole person or self as in Paul.[2] In Saying 82 it refers to the cosmos, and the meaning of σῶμα must be "dead body" as πτῶμα applies to cosmos in Saying 58.[3] There are two other sayings which are decisive for the interpretation of "body" and "soul" in the Gospel of Thomas. They are Nos. 89 and 113, which are two versions of one saying.

---

[1] We acknowledge that a problem poses itself in Saying 29. In it Jesus speaks of his having "appeared" or "been revealed to them (men) in [fḷẹs]h." If σάρξ-σῶμα is conceived in the Gnostic sense in the Gospel of Thomas, what are we to make of what seems to be "incarnation" in Saying 29? To the Gnostics an actual incarnation of the heavenly Messenger in the Johannine sense would be unthinkable (But see The Gospel of Truth, 20:10-21:2, Grobel, op. cit., pp. 62-68.). One solution to the dilemma presented by No. 29 would be simply to say that we should not impose a rigid consistency upon the collection, for, as Doresse remarks, Les livres secret . . . , pp. 285, 286, all the texts of the Chenoboskion library borrow from each other with complete lack of logic. A second solution would be to exercise caution in reading "incarnation" into the expression ΑΕΙΟΥΩΝϨ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑΥ ϨΝ̄ ΣΑΡΞ. This Coptic clause is certainly the translation of a text much like Oxy. Pap. 1:3 (see chap. ii), where these words occur: καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὤφθην αὐτοῖς (See Crum, Dictionary, p. 486a). The verb ὁράω in the passive means simply "to be seen, to appear," and does not rule out a docetic christology. Contrast this with Jn. 1:14: καὶ ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκῆνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν.

[2] Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 192-203.

[3] See above, p. 208.

Because of their likeness to each other they are placed in parallel columns below.

Saying 89	Saying 113
Jesus said, "Wretched is the body which is dependent on a body; and wre[tc]hed is the soul which is dependent on both of them."	Jesus said, "Woe to the flesh whic[h is d]ependent on the soul; (and) woe to the soul which is dependent on the [fle]sh."

The close relation between 89 and 113 shows that "body" and "soul" are equivalent terms as in Saying 30. The meaning of psyche is more difficult to determine. The first alternative is to take it in the usual Gnostic sense. According to the Gnostic trichotomy, man is one part of divine origin ("spirit") and two parts ("flesh-body" and "soul") of lower origin. Generally speaking, the seven planetary powers, the Archons, made man of ὑλή and ψυχή, the first the shapeless mass of matter, the second comprising the appetites and passions. Each of the Archons imparted to man something of his own nature, and these separate elements combined make up man's "soul." Man was made by the Archons in this fashion for the express purpose of keeping the pneumatic element imprisoned in the "body and soul" that it might not return to its place of origin outside the range and dominion of the seven Powers. Therefore, if the "spirit" in man is to be saved, both "flesh" and "soul" must be "peeled off" like the layers of an onion in the process of salvation, in the ascent of the pneumatic element, that the true nature may be released from its prison-house and rise above to true being with God.[1] It could be that Sayings 89 and 113 hint at the negative character of body and soul by referring to the mutual wretchedness of both in their being "hung to" or "pendant from" one another. The use of the qualitative form in both sayings and in the Sahidic version of the New Testament suggests this interpretation as a possibility.[2]

The second alternative is to interpret psyche, not in the depreciatory sense, but as indicating the "person" or "self," as it is certainly used of Jesus in Saying 29.[3] The same meaning of psyche is found in Saying 26[4] and in various places in the New Testament.[5] Consequently, we would not have the tri-partite division of man in *Thomas*. From this point of view Sayings 89 and 113 would mean that the "body" and the "self" (the *true* self) are in antithetical relation to each other; hence, the "self" must become separate from the "body" in order to be free. The tendency of the "self" or "person" may be to exist in a state of "dependence on[1] the body" (or "flesh"), but this tendency has to be subverted if salvation is to be experienced. The translation which has been adopted indicates a preference for the second of the two choices; yet, the peculiar phrasing, especially of Saying 113, leaves the issue in doubt. The first possibility may be the correct one.

---

[1] Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, pp. 42-47, and *Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist*, pp. 178-90.

[2] The verb is **ΕΙϢΕ**, "be hung, suspended," of which the qualitative form is **ΑϢΕ** (89), **ΟϢΕ** (113). With the prep. N̄- (89 and 113) the meaning may be "be hung; depend." Crum, *Dictionary*, p. 88b. See Mt. 22:40; Lk. 23:39; Gal: 3:13, for the use of the qualitative in *The Coptic Version of the New Testament . . .*, I, II, V.

[3] "My soul (ψυχή) gr[iev]ed over the sons of men . . . ."

[4] "Love your brother as your self" (ψυχή).

[5] Acts 2:43; 3:32; Ro. 2:9; 13:1; II Cor. 12:15. See Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 204.

The Conception of Knowledge

A working definition of Gnosticism has already been given,[2] and from that definition there is the implicit suggestion that the mere presence of the terms "know" (ΣOOYN = γινώσκω) and "knowledge" (ΣOOYN =γνῶσις) does not guarantee a Gnostic point of view. Even if we find the belief that salvation is by means of knowledge, we must not necessarily assume that a given document is Gnostic. Dodd remarks that there is a sense in which Christian theologians like Clement of Alexandria and Origen could be called Gnostics if we define Gnosticism in the broad sense of the belief in salvation by means of knowledge.[3] This, however, is insufficient in classifying a document as Gnostic. As Casey points out,

> Γνῶσις was used of the right apprehension of revealed truth by the orthodox and heretics alike and secondarily of a participation in the nature of God. The

---

[1] According to Crum, *Dictionary*, p. 88b, EIϢE may be used in the metaphorical sense, which seems to be the case in 89 and 113.

[2] Above, p. 212.

[3] *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 97.

> orthodox objected to the claims of heretics to possess a knowledge of the truth and described their opinions as false knowledge.[1]

The terms "know" and "knowledge" were in themselves perfectly acceptable to orthodox Christian theologians; Louis Bouyer states that "pas une seule fois Irénée n'emploie le terme de 'gnostique', à plus forte raison le terme de 'gnose', dans un sens défavorable."[2]

The upshot of this discussion is that in Thomas "know," "knowledge," and related terms are used in a specific Gnostic sense. "Knowledge" is never mentioned as one of the gifts of faith, as in Paul, nor is it referred to as closely related to or the equivalent of faith, as in the Fourth Gospel.[3] It is both an experience and a quality of existence that is quite distinctive from the New Testament emphasis upon faith.

There are important clues in the collection that show what is meant by the terms. Not unrelated to this aspect of the sayings is the emphasis upon "seeking and finding." The truth in the sayings of Jesus is difficult "to find," but it is essential that one "seek" and thus come "to know" the truth.[4]

---

[1] "The Study of Gnosticism," p. 55.

[2] "Gnosis: Le sens orthodoxe de l'expression jusqua'aux pères alexandrins," Journal of Theological Studies, IV (October, 1953), 200.

[3] Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 326-29; II, 73-74.

[4] Preface, Sayings 1, 25, 39, 51, 60, 61, 62, 78, 94, 95, 110, 111, 112.

Esoteric quality.--Three sayings in particular suggest this aspect of knowledge in Thomas. The first is No. 12. Here the disciple Thomas is given private instruction by Jesus upon the "three words," which would be completely meaningless were it not for two references in patristic literature.[1] Saying 19 also appears to be intentionally obscure. As we have seen,[2] the "five trees" are widely used symbols in Gnostic literature. On the surface they appear to be nothing more than "trees of knowledge," but there must be some shade of meaning intended to be understood which we may never discover. The third of these sayings is No. 64, which in the reconstructed translation is as follows: Jesus said, "I tell my mysteries [to those who are sons of my m]ysteries." The two occurrences of μυστήριον in this saying are the only instances of the word's appearance in the entire collection, but if the reconstruction is correct, the word bears a very important connotation. Along with the opening words of the collection ("These are the secret words which the Living Jesus spoke . . . ."), μυστήριον here indicates not mere vagueness in the content of Thomas but actual secrecy with regard to the inner meaning of the sayings. The word μυστήριον is not used as in Mk. 4:11 (// Mt. 13:11 // Lk. 8:10) to indicate some aspect of the kingdom of God imparted only to the disciples but not to the people in general.[1] Neither does it mean the plan or intention of God once concealed but now disclosed in the Christian revelation.[2] *Thomas* also is far from giving any eschatological connotation to the word,[3] but the meaning in Saying 64 is a bit closer to the use of **μυστήριον** in Eph. 5:32, which speaks of a hidden meaning in a passage from the Old Testament. Here the writer gives an allegorical interpretation of Gen. 2:24. Nevertheless, we must look elsewhere for the background of the word as it is used in our collection. In the mystery religions of the ancient Hellenistic world τὰ μυστήρια signified the rites of the cultic festivals in which the sacred drama of the deity was enacted. By participation in these mystery rites the devotees were believed to be united with the god and to be assured of salvation.[1] An attempt was made to keep the initiatory rites secret; they were not to be disclosed to anyone but were reserved for the religious group. In Gnosticism μυστήριον had a two-fold aspect: (1) it indicated a secret, ineffable word or doctrine which could be discerned only by the "perfect Gnostics;"[2] (2) it specified a revelation insofar as it imparted life to the "perfect Gnostics" through the disclosure of the mystery.[3] The Gnostic concept of mystery took over and modified the earlier concept of the mystery religions. The sayings in the Gospel of Thomas give one the impression of bearing the two-fold significance of μυστήριον in Gnosticism. One further reference is given that may suggest an additional connotation of the word as it appears in Thomas. With respect to the Hermetic literature, Richard Reitzenstein says that μυστήριον may designate the sacred doctrine contained in the writings. The experience of the one who received the vision initially as recorded in the sacred writing may become magically effective upon the reader. In this view the content of the writing is the λόγος τῆς παλιγγενεσίας.[1] To some extent the sayings of Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas may have been considered to have a special potency upon the reader; yet, the dominant emphasis lies upon the idea that the meaning of the sayings and the transforming effect of the doctrine contained in them are made available only to those who are "worthy of Jesus' mysteries." The truth is not open to the general public, but only to a limited number of men who are capable of receiving it.

---

[1] See above, chap. iii, p.117, under discussion on the Naassenes.

[2] Ibid., p.135, under discussion of the Pistis Sophia.

---

[1] Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1952), p. 25. Could this "secret" be meant by the Synoptists as the disclosure of the Messiahship of Jesus to the disciples alone? See *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1942), IV, 825.

[2] Ro. 16:25; I Cor. 2:1, 7; 4:1; Eph. 1:9; 3:3, 9; 6:19; Col. 1:26, 27; 2:2; 4:3; I Tim. 3:9, 16. In a similar fashion Ignatius *Eph*. 19:1 writes of three "mysteries:" (1) Mary's virginity, (2) her giving birth to Jesus, (3) the death of Jesus. He adds that all these things "escaped the notice of the prince of this world." The incarnation and the atonement are again mentioned in *Magn*. 9:1-3 as "this mystery." Finally, in *Trall*. 2:3 he writes of "Those who are deacons of Christ's 'mysteries' . . . ." The latter reference may also indicate the incarnation and the atonement as mysteries and may reflect "the mystery of Christ" found in Eph. 3:4 and Col. 4:3. Ignatius uses the term in somewhat the same way as the majority of the passages in the New Testament. The "mysteries" are the secrets of God, once concealed, but now revealed. This shown by the fact that the incarnation and the atonement "escaped the notice" of Satan. See *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, ed. James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922), II, 49-62. See also Heinrich Schlier, *Religions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatius-briefen* (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Toepelmann, 1929), pp. 5, 6, on the Christological interest in Ignatius where the term **μυστήριον** occurs.

[3] As in Ro. 11:25, wherein there is mentioned the "mystery" of the current hardening of a part of Israel but the ultimate salvation of the same. This "secret" may be partly unfolded now, but its full realization will come only in the future when jealousy of the Gentiles will cause Israel to be saved.

---

[1] Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, IV, 810.

[2] Hippolytus Ref. V. 3, and Rudolf Bultmann, Gnosis, Vol. V: Bible Key Words, trans. and ed. J. R. Coates (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952), p. 7.

[3] Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, IV, 818.

Self-knowledge.--Turning to particular occurrences of ΣOOYN, we are at once struck with the significance given to self-knowledge. This is a central concept of Gnosticism. It is not, however,

> identical with Socrates' self-examination (Plato, Apol. 38a), which means looking into the mind and its powers. It is knowledge of the soul's Whence and Whither, . . . he who knows that he came originally out of the world of life and light will ultimately return to it.[2]

---

[1] Richard Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (Dritte Auflage; Leipzig: Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1927), p. 243.

[2] Bultmann, Gnosis, pp. 11, 12. On p. 12, note 5, Bultmann adds the following: "Clem. Al. Exc. ex Theodotus, 78: 'It is not baptism alone that sets us free, but also knowing (gnosis) what we were and what we have become, where we were or where we were driven, where we are hurrying, from what we are cleansed, what birth is, and what rebirth'. According to Hippolytus, Ref. V, xvi, 1, it is said by the Perates

Once again Saying 52 comes to mind. It mentions the self's "Whence" as being "the light," and identifies the Gnostic as "his (the Father's) sons, . . . the elect of the Living Father." Coupled with Saying 51, we get the additional aspect of self-knowledge, the self's "Whither," preceded by a clause indicating its origin as well: "Blessed are you solitary and elect ones; for you shall find the kingdom, because you are from it (and) you shall return to it."

Saying 2 is also preeminent in connection with the emphasis upon self-knowledge: "Whenever you know yourselves,

---

[an Ophite Gnostic sect, see E. F. Scott in E.R.E. VI, 238; IX, 500]: 'We alone know the necessity of birth, and the ways by which man enters the world, and so being fully instructed we alone are able to pass through and beyond decay' (περᾶσαι τὴν φϑοράν); and Ref. V, vi, 6: 'they think knowledge of man the beginning of the possibility of knowledge of God, calling the one the beginning of perfection and the other the end'. Cf. Acta Thomae, 15, p. 121, 12f.; Corp. Herm. I, 19, 21; IV, 4f.; M. Lidzbarski, Das Johannesbuch der Mandaeer (1915), 170, 18; 171, 17; 180, 15f.; Norden, Agnostos Theos, 102 ff.; Kroll, Lehren d. Herm. Tr. 372 ff.; Bousset, Kyrios Chr. 201 f.; Reitzenstein, Hell. Myst. 291; G. P. Wetter, N.Z.W. 18 (1917-18), 49ff.

"A Philosophical turn is given to this thought of self-knowledge, e.g. by Hierocles of Alexandria (d. A.D. 485) in his commentary on Pythagoras' Carmen Aureum (ed. F. W. A. Mullach, 1853), 137 ff. esp. 141, 2ff.; 142, 1ff.; and at Plotinus, Enn. VI, ix, 7; cf. V, i, 1; Porphyry Abst. III, 27 (p. 226, 15ff. Nauck): 'the wicked man yields to the mortal side of his nature until he loses all true knowledge of himself'. The moral aspect is also presented at Clem. Al. Paedagogus III, iii; Strom. III, vi, 44." We should also mention that the Naassene Gnostics placed great emphasis upon self-knowledge as equated with the knowledge of the kingdom. According to them the grain of mustard (= the kingdom) is the "indivisible point" in man. To know this "point" one must be a spiritual man. The knowledge of it is self-knowledge, which brings release from material bondage. See Hippolytus Ref. V. 4.

then you will be known, and you will understand that you are the sons of the Living Father." It is not accidental that No. 2 is placed near the beginning of the collection. Notice also that it equates self-knowledge with the knowledge of the kingdom, which is in one's "interior . . . and exterior." In Saying 47 in relation to a statement on the greatness of John the Baptist, there is the declaration, "he who shall be small among you shall know the kingdom."[1] The underlined phrase is one that never occurs in the New Testament. Its use in the Gospel of Thomas indicates that both "knowledge" and "the kingdom" have different meanings from what is found in the New Testament. Quite often the canonical Gospels speak of "entering the kingdom."[2] The same phrase occurs in Sayings 23 and 115, but this is not the dominant interest of the Gospel of Thomas. Most of the sayings which deal with the kingdom have some contact with "knowledge," "knowing," or "seeking" and "finding."[3]

Knowing the world.--We have already mentioned the

---

[1] The word "small" in 47 implies a relationship with No. 23 where the disciples ask, "if we become small (like little children), shall we enter the kingdom?" Saying 23 implies the abolition of sexual distinctions and suggests sexual asceticism, possibly, as a prerequisite to entering the kingdom. It is likely that 47 means the same thing. On the meaning of the expression "know the kingdom," see below, chap. vi, p. 250.

[2] Mt. 5:20; 7:21; 19:23, 24; 21:31; Mk. 9:47; 10:23, 24, 25; Lk. 18:24, 25; Jn. 3:5.

[3] See Sayings 2, 20, 28, 59, 78, 98, 99, 110.

Gnostic reversal of the typical Greek concept of the world.[1] Here we should add that the Gnostics did not think of the cosmos as mere physical substance which is neutral in nature. It is rather the realm in which evil spiritual powers are the direct antithesis to the transcendent God who is utterly different from the world. Since man's true self is derived from the world of light beyond this κόσμος below, he must be emancipated from "this world" in order to return to his place of origin. The enlightenment of Gnosis brings emancipation, and Gnosis has both positive and negative aspects. It is necessary to know "'what we were and what we have become.'"[2] We are presently concerned with the negative aspect of knowledge,[3] which the expression "'what we have become'" implies. In *Thomas* considerable stress is placed upon cognition of the cosmos as the negative aspect of human existence. Two sayings, 58 and 82, are of special interest. We have already touched upon these,[4] but only pertaining to the essence of the cosmos. Since they are closely related, they are placed side by side.

Saying 58	Saying 82
Jesus said, "He who has known (recognized?) the	Jesus said, "He who has known (recognized?) the

---

[1] Above, p. 209.

[2] Above, p. 223, note 2. Clem. Alex. *Exc. ex Theod.* 78.

[3] The positive aspect is reserved for a more complete exposition below, chap. vi.

[4] Above, p. 208.

world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) has found a corpse (ΠΤΩΜΑ), and he who has found a corpse (ΠΤΩΜΑ), the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) is not worthy of him."	world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) has found the body (ΣΩΜΑ), but he who has found the body (ΣΩΜΑ), the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) is not worthy of him."

It is important for man "to recognize, to know" the world for what it is, that he may be freed from it and not be enmeshed in death. The fact of "knowing the world" is equated with release from it; cognition and true being occur at the same moment. Saying 111 is closely related in thought to 58 and 82: Jesus said, "He who has found the world (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ) and has become rich, let him deny [the] world" (ΚΟΣΜΟΣ). The way in which "know"and "find" are used in 58, 82, and 111 shows that the two terms are essentially synonymous. "Finding" or "knowing" the "world" means to discern its essential character, and the very discerning brings the "wealth" of Gnosis, or better, *is* the "wealth" of Gnosis. The person who thus knows is the only one of whom "the world is not worthy," and he is the only one who is in a position to "deny (say no to) [the] world."[1]

Other sayings stress the importance of knowing various things,[2] but the above are sufficient to point out the primary meanings of ΣOOYN. It seems obvious, then, that we are in the realm of Gnostic terminology and theology which affects the interpretation of the entire collection of sayings.

---

[1] From the use of ΣΟΟΥΝ we again observe the dualistic tendency of the *Gospel of Thomas*. First it is important to know the self, the kingdom (Sayings 2 and 47), Jesus (Sayings 4, 15, 18, 44), and the Father (Sayings 15, 71). Then it is urgent to know the negative aspect of existence, the world (Sayings 58, 82, 111) and related objects (flesh, body). Yet, the knowledge of both the positive and the negative aspects is a simultaneous experience.

[2] Such are Sayings 4, 11, 16, 18, 22, 40, 44, 64, 67, 69, 71, 98, 99, 104, 106, 110.

Conclusion

The preceding analysis has demonstrated that the *Gospel of Thomas* presupposes a Gnostic point of view. First of all, we noticed the occurrence of certain terms or symbols which are best understood as the common property of the various schools of Gnosticism to describe the typical experience of man when he receives knowledge of his true nature. There is evidence that *Thomas* was influenced by the Gnostic figures of "sleep" and "awakening." Even more certain is the fact that the symbol of "drunkenness" was taken over in *Thomas* in the dual sense of intoxication with worldly ignorance, on the one hand, and intoxication with illuminating knowledge, on the other. Next, we examined the terms and their qualifying adjectives that are indicative of a dualistic world-view. The use of the symbols of "light" and "darkness" we found to be instructive and suggestive, but of greater significance are the findings with respect to *Thomas's* delineation of the cosmos as the realm of death. The latter element proves without question an essentially dualistic view of the world. Our collection presupposes the sharp contrast of Gnostic thought between God and the world, man and nature, spirit and matter. This brings us to the basic anthropological terms occurring in

Thomas, and although we were unable to decide positively on the precise distinction between "spirit," "soul," and "body," we nevertheless discerned that "spirit" is the element in man that originated from the world of light and shall return to it. At the same time, the lower material nature is that which shrouds the "spirit" in darkness and death; the former must be denied and sloughed off by the latter if salvation occurs. We also deduced that the absence of myth in the sayings tends to verify the definition of Gnosticism as having to do primarily with a radical view of man and the world.[1] Finally, we examined the "conception of knowledge" demonstrated by the sayings. Typically Gnostic is the esoteric quality of the sayings, which is shown both by the outward dress of the material in Thomas and by the explicit references to the hiddenness of the truth in the sayings of Jesus. They contain "mysteries" available only to the "worthy." We also pointed out the centrality of the concept of self-knowledge and distinguished the Gnostic view from the Socratic. The sayings exhibit from the very beginning this central concern of Gnosticism, and numerous examples may be given to show how large a part it played in the thought of the Gnostic community that used the collection. Then we touched upon the negative aspect of knowledge as it pertains to a recognition of the essential character of the cosmos as the order in which man is a prisoner. The "wealth" of Gnosis enables man to choose to be free from the world, "to say no to the world" and to give an affirmative response to the One who brings salvation to him. With the groundwork laid down in the present chapter, we are now in a position to examine more fully the teachings of _Thomas_ with respect to man's nature, what his dilemma is, and wherein his experience of salvation consists. Our discussion anticipates the more extensive treatment in the following chapter.

---

[1] Above, p. 212.

CHAPTER VI

THEOLOGY IN THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS

Introduction

The preceding discussion in Chapters III, IV, and V leads inevitably to our treatment of the theology in the collection. By a process of induction we have reached the place where the numerous fragments may be pieced together in a more or less consistent pattern. Our purpose is to make several generalizations in relation to basic theological concerns. In defense of the title of the chapter, "Theology *in* . . ." rather than "Theology *of* the Gospel of Thomas," we affirm the necessity of caution in imposing too rigid a structure upon the collection. Extended research has shown a remarkable degree of coherence; at the same time, however, we must make allowance for possible discrepancies or contradictions in the treatment of certain ideas. This is best explained by the textual history of the document, which entailed a process of redaction from the more to the less orthodox form. We should also be careful in judging the work by our own standards of consistency, which are certainly not the equivalent of those of the Gnostic community. Given the opportunity to set forth its views systematically, the group responsible for our collection may not have chosen the various categories used below.

Even so, the analysis has been formulated as it stands for two reasons: (1) to approximate as nearly as possible the basic interests of the _Gospel of Thomas_ in order that we may not distort its primary tenets; (2) to facilitate our understanding of the document. Our procedure involves a typical beginning with the teaching on cosmology. We move then to what seem to be the primary concerns of _Thomas_, anthropology, salvation, and eschatology. Two other topics are dealt with, the nature of the Kingdom of God and the conception of Jesus. Of special interest to us is the question of what the community thought about Jesus. Here we shall find a rather strange portrait of Him who is central in Christian life and thought. He is of great significance to this Gnostic community also, but He is far different from the Jesus of the canonical Gospels, as we shall see.

Cosmology

There is scant evidence for a cosmological scheme in the _Gospel of Thomas_. For those who compiled the sayings there seems to have been only slight interest in such speculations, at least for the purposes of the collection itself.[1] The evidence is somewhat confusing, and we may not draw a very clear picture of the document's conceptions at this point. We have already observed the work's Gnostic character and to a considerable degree have demonstrated its dominant features; yet, we do not have here a full-blown Gnostic system. Cosmological ideas are only implied in certain sayings, which, incidentally, may have been derived from a variety of sources.

---

[1] Above, chap. v, p. 212, where we showed that a cosmological myth is not the primary thing, but rather the basic world view is the distinguishing mark of Gnosticism.

We find Saying 11 of unusual interest. Here "James the Just" is referred to as the one "on whose account heaven and earth came into being." The emphasis does not lie upon James, however, but upon "the place" whence the disciples came and to which they go.[1] Nevertheless, the saying expresses the notion that the world "came into being" for the sake of righteous persons such as James.[2] The implication is that the created order is basically good; the natural world is divinely ordained. The Old Testament so teaches, but this Jewish belief cuts straight across Gnostic thought on the origin of the world. According to the Gnostics the kosmos came into existence by means of one or more imperfect divine beings working upon evil matter.

Saying 11 contrasts sharply with Saying 12. We have seen that the "three words" of the latter may have the Naassene cosmology as their basis.[3] If so, the "lower realm" or the world in which man dwells, is considered to be evil, and all contact with it must be severed if man is to be saved. We must not omit Saying 21, the Parable of the Children on the Field. While absolute certainty may not be possible, it may very well be that 21 is a picture of what happens to the Gnostic at death. Since the earth is not his true home, he leaves it to the Archons. Then, divested of the garment of flesh, he rises to true being above the realm of the planetary Powers (Archons).[1] Once more a Gnostic cosmological scheme may be implied. Our deductions are strengthened by the dualistic world-view of Thomas.[2] Sayings 58 and 82 teach that the cosmos is only a "dead body," and according to 111 the Gnostic must "deny the cosmos."

---

[1] See above, chap. iii, p.105, and below, under "Salvation."

[2] That is, if the subordinate emphasis rests upon "Just." So Piper, "The Gospel of Thomas," p. 22.

[3] Above, chap. iii, pp.117-18.

The contradiction is apparent. Saying 11 represents the Hebraic belief in the goodness of the world which God created, but Sayings 12, 58, 82, and 111 indicate some type of Gnostic cosmology lying behind the sayings and comprising part of the total view of the community. No. 11 may be a remnant of an earlier, more orthodox recension of Thomas. The other sayings show that the final form of Thomas was decidedly Gnostic in its world-view, even though the scheme of things is not carefully defined.[3] Yet, we should not overlook the possibility that Saying 11 was not taken at its face value by the Gnostic community as we are prone to do, which is to say that No. 11 may have been allegorized so as to give it an altogether different meaning from that which it appears to have.

---

[1] Above, chap. iv, note 1, p. 166.

[2] Above, chap. v, pp. 206-18 .

[3] The publication and study of the remaining documents of the Chenoboskion Library may illuminate the cosmological perspective of the Gospel of Thomas.

Anthropology, Salvation, and Eschatology

Anthropology.--In Chapter V we examined the sayings dealing with the real nature of man.[1] His true essence is the pneumatic element which has somehow come to dwell in the "poverty" of the "flesh." While we may not demonstrate conclusively the tri-partite division of man into body-soul-spirit, we reiterate the argument that we are still in the realm of Gnostic anthropological conceptions in the use of the terms "body" and "spirit."

At this point an important question poses itself: Is there any further evidence that would suggest a three-fold classification of mankind into hylic, psychic, and pneumatic?[2]

---

[1] Above, chap. v, pp. 210-18 . See also Sayings 13, 30, 58, 89, 113.

[2] Wilson, op. cit., p. 208, says, "Gnosticism, like paganism, attempts to explain the dual nature of man by some theory of a divine principle which has somehow entered into the material world. The most extreme form appears in certain varieties of the Valentinianism, where men are distinguished in three classes, the hylic, who have no part in the divine principle and are doomed to perish; the psychic, who have freedom of will either to ascend or to descend, but may not enter the Pleroma, and the pneumatic, who alone are predestined to full salvation. More usually men are distinguished according to the preponderance of one element or another, and it is possible to pass from one grade to another through receipt of

We should begin by saying that there is no utterance in the collection which explicitly divides mankind into these three groups, but there are several units which suggest a sort of predestination or determinism. For example, there are those who are favored by Jesus' "choosing" or "electing" them.[1] The Wise Fisherman Parable (Saying 7) teaches that only the Gnostic man is "chosen" out of the multitudes of men. In Saying 24 Jesus chooses "one out of a thousand and two out of ten thousand," implying that only a small number are actually destined for salvation. In Saying 51 the "solitary and elect ones" are called "blessed" by Jesus because they are the ones who originated out of the kingdom and they shall surely "return to it." This sounds quite like the description of some men as pneumatics whose origin and destiny is divine,[2] and who are set over against the purely hylic men who by nature are doomed. Saying 73 (a gnosticized version of Mk. 4:25 and parallels) clearly shows that the men who do not have within them some essential principle shall surely perish![3]

In Saying 29 Jesus is made to say that He found all

---

the enlightening γνῶσις. Here Gnosticism reflects a confusion apparent very early in philosophy, all men being considered to possess the divine spark, while only some--who possess the divine spark!--are destined to salvation." cf. above, chap. v, p. 213, note 2.

[1] Cf. Jn. 6:37, 39, 65.

[2] Ibid., and Sayings 19, 52, 86.

[3] See also Sayings 76 and 77.

men "drunken," with none of them being "thirsty," apparently for the "water of life" which He alone gives. In itself No. 29 may be taken only as teaching that prior to the revelation which Jesus brings everyone is "blind" and "drunken," though after He gives His revelation the pneumatics receive the enlightenment of Gnosis while the hylics remain in darkness. Other sayings, however, point out the possibility that there are some men who have the ability in themselves to choose and who may be either saved or lost. The exhortations to seek and find,[1] which are quite numerous, imply that there are many whose destiny hangs upon their willingness to expend the effort necessary to a diligent search. Moreover, the Parable of the Woman with the Jar of Meal (Saying 98) seems to teach that there are some who may not be aware of their great loss until it is too late to make a recovery. Does this mean that there are those who fit the classification of the psychic men who may or may not experience salvation?[2] We admit the vagueness of the sayings that touch upon the issue, but the assumption of a three-fold classification of men as hylic, psychic, and pneumatic would do away with the ambiguity. It would also clear up the uncertainty with regard to the use of the terms themselves.[3]

---

[1] Sayings 1, 18, 25, 39, 60, 61, 62, 78, 94, 95, 110, 111, 112.

[2] As in Valentinianism. See Wilson, op. cit., p. 132.

[3] Above, chap. v, pp. 210-18 , and Sayings 89 and 113.

Salvation and Eschatology.--The attempt to organize these concepts runs the risk of distorting the sayings themselves. *Thomas* does not clearly define such things as the *object* of salvation, the *means* of salvation, and the *content* of salvation. These three aspects of the subject may be fused together by the sayings. It is necessary, however, so to formulate our discussion for the sake of our own understanding of the various phases of thought.

From previous consideration of the nature of man we would logically conclude that the object or purpose of salvation is to free the pneumatic element from its imprisonment in the body, but the objective toward which the Gnostic is said to strive[1] is not defined in this way. To designate the goal of salvation use is made of two words which undoubtedly have a Jewish background: (1) "rest"[2] and (2) "place."[3] We immediately recognize the use of the term "rest" in both the Old and New Testaments. The more spiritual connotation of the word in the Old Testament has to do with tranquil rest in the land of Canaan with the assurance of the presence of God.[4]

---

[1] The emphasis in *Thomas* upon striving to achieve salvation, and perhaps to remain in a state of salvation after the initial experience of Gnosis, distinguishes the concept of salvation somewhat from those systems in which Gnosis is primarily a "gift (χάρισμα) from God to man." Bultmann, *Gnosis*, p. 9.

[2] Sayings 52, 53, 62, 63, 88, 92.

[3] Sayings 3, 11, 25, 31, 52, 62, 66, 70, 88, 100.

[4] See. Dt. 12:9; Ps. 23:2; 95:11; Isa. 28:12.

Used as a symbol of the goal of salvation it signifies repose in God in the Gospel of Thomas.[1]

Perhaps even more important is the use of "place" (τόπος or Coptic MA) to refer to the goal of salvation. We find that the Palestinian rabbis discussed the concept "place" as an appellation of God. The following discourse occurs in the Genesis Rabbah:

> And he lighted upon the place (xxviii, 11). R. Huna said in R. Ammi's name: Why do we give a changed name to the Holy One, blessed be he, and call him "the place?" Because He is the Place of the world. R. Jose b. Halafta said: We do not know whether God is the place of His world or whether His world is His place, but from the verse, Behold there is a place with me (Ex. xxxiii, 21), it follows that the Lord is the place of His world, but His world is not His place.[2]

Part of the meaning seems to be that "God is everywhere in the corporeal world, thereby exercising His individual providence, but He is no part of the corporeal world and is unlike anything in it."[3] The concept may be further explained by the use which Philo made of it. Basing his thought upon an Aristotelian precedent in the use of the term "place," Philo stated that God could be figuratively called a "place" (τόπος)

---

[1] The argument in Hebrews 4:1-11 concerning the future rest, now only partially realized by Christians, does not fit into the pattern of Thomas. Our collection emphasizes the present aspect of salvation, almost to the complete exclusion of the futuristic element. See below on "Eschatology."

[2] Midrash Rabbah, II, 620, 621.

[3] Harry Austryn Wolfson, Philo (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947), I, 247.

"by reason . . . of His being that to which all things flee for refuge."[1] Aristotle had said that "the proper places" of "things in the world" are "the goals toward which" they "move naturally and in which they rest naturally . . . each of the elements 'naturally tends to be borne towards its own place (χώραν).'"[2] Consequently, according to Philo, God is the goal or place toward which all things move and in which all things rest.[3]

The use of "place" by the rabbis and Philo may have served as the basis for the same idea in Thomas, although we cannot define the precise relationship of our collection with the rabbis and Philo. Hence, in Saying 25 the disciples ask Jesus to show them "the place (τόπος) where you are, since it is necessary for us to seek after it." "Place" designates the goal toward which the Gnostic aspires in his striving for salvation. Accordingly we find the "place of life" in Saying 3, and quite significantly in 52 the disciples are instructed to testify that they came from "the place out of which the light came [there] from Him (?) alone." This latter reference may mean that they originally had their being in God. Saying 11, which also magnifies "the place," indicates that they are to return to their "place" of origin. Saying 31, so frequently mistranslated by those who have been engaged in the initial study of *Thomas*, becomes understandable: "At the *place* where there are three godly ones, they are *in God*; at the *place* where there are two or one, I am with him." Here "the place" is not thought of in space-time categories; it is rather a status or condition of "being in God." So also Saying 70 is clarified: "You are blessed whenever they hate you and persecute you, and they shall not find *place* (τόπος) in the *place* in which they persecuted you." Here "place" does not refer to a geographical location, but refers to the Gnostics' being persecuted "in their heart," as Saying 71 shows! The persecutors shall find no "place" in the "heart" (their own hearts), which is a veiled way of saying that they shall not know themselves or that they shall not reach the goal of salvation--abiding in "the place," or "being in God."

---

[1] Ibid., p. 249.

[2] Ibid., pp. 249, 250.

[3] Ibid., p. 250.

Toward the goal thus defined the means of salvation is directed. We shall first consider this aspect of the subject from the negative point of view. One of the more interesting things about *Thomas* is the absence of ethical teachings. Apparently ethics had little meaning for the community, at least in the scheme of salvation. Only three sins are mentioned: (1) lying, (2) blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, and (3) usury.[1] Nothing is said of forgiveness except in Saying 45 with respect to blasphemy against the Father and the Son. Brotherly love is enjoined,[1] but nothing is said of the implications of such a commandment as we find it in the New Testament.[2] The non-ethical stance of the sayings is not surprising, for man's plight is not moral but rather is grounded in the very nature of his existence as man. Still further, we hardly need reminding that there is no place for rite or sacrament in the experience of salvation. The Jewish practices of fasting, prayer, almsgiving, Sabbath observance, and circumcision are rejected in their literal form and are completely and radically spiritualized.[3] Institutional observances, then, have no place in the collection. Also conspicuous by their absence are magical formulas or secret cosmological lore essential to the soul's passage through the spheres of the hostile Archons[4] (with the possible exception of Saying 52). As we have already seen, some kind of Gnostic cosmology lies at the base of the sayings, but specific knowledge of a Gnostic myth is not laid down as a requirement for one's salvation; that is, unless Saying 12 may

---

[1] Sayings 5, 45, and 96, respectively. The real concern in No. 5 does not seem to be mere lying. The implication is that the disciples must have great respect for the truth as it is revealed in the secret words of Jesus. Notice that No. 5's

---

"what you hate do not do" is very close to Tobit 4:15: "And what thou thyself hatest, do to no man." This further suggests Jewish or Jewish-Christian connections somewhere along the way.

[1] Saying 26.

[2] See Lk. 10:25-37.

[3] Sayings 5, 13, 28, 55, 105.

[4] Cf. Doresse, The Secret Books . . . , pp. 99, 103, 105, 267, 274; Irenaeus Adv. Haer. I. 21. 5.

be so interpreted.[1]

On the positive side, various sayings make sexual asceticism not merely advisable but an absolutely necessary correlate of salvation. In Saying 21 the disciples of Jesus are described as little children for whom sexual distinctions are meaningless. In 23 one must realize a higher unity apart from sex before he can "enter the kingdom." Even more emphatic is No. 38 where Jesus makes the abolition of sex, and obviously sexual relations, necessary for one to become a "son of the Living One." Most severe of all is Saying 63 where celibacy is stated to be a condition of life![2] These sayings may reflect the _Gospel of the Egyptians_[3] or the Naassene rejection of sexual intercourse.[4] At any rate, the final form of _Thomas_ understood sexual asceticism to be essential to salvation. Certainly no ethical concern is in evidence here. One may be inclined to contradict this assertion. In one sense, we could say that this represents an ethical concern insofar as involvement in fleshly passions results in one's being held a prisoner in evil matter and in being absorbed in base material concerns which are a violation of his true nature. On the other side, however, there lies the fact that we cannot equate the Gnostic point of view with the ethical emphasis of the Old or New Testaments. The Biblical view is that morality entails conduct that is consistent with the character, purpose, and will of a righteous God, and is not dictated by a metaphysical dualism as in Gnostic thought. According to the Gnostic view, man's conduct may become either ascetic or libertinistic, depending on whether one should have a morbid fear of sensual involvement or a sophisticated contempt of all things material whereby one believes himself already essentially free from the world of matter. In the latter case, what does it matter if the flesh engages in licentious conduct? The spirit is free, is saved, and can no longer be affected by what happens to the flesh.[1] The asceticism of Thomas is an expression of the Gnostic's fear of being bound in the prison-house of the body and of the attempt to be released from it. Basically this is not a matter of ethics.

---

[1] On these last two points see chap. iii, pp. 98,117.

[2] See also Sayings 81, 107, and 115.

[3] Clement of Alexandria, _Stromateis_ III. 9. 63; III. 13. 92; see chap. iii, p.108.

[4] Hippolytus, _Ref_. V. 2.

That which is mainly essential to salvation, however, is knowledge. It is above all else the means of salvation. We may even say that salvation is not a matter of knowledge plus celibacy or the transcendence of sexual differences; as a matter of fact, it is the finding or knowing in the first place[1] which brings enlightenment concerning the necessity of sexual asceticism as an adjunct to the condition of salvation. At this point there is a twofold aspect to the concept of knowledge in Thomas. First, there is considerable stress in the collection upon knowing the interpretation of the secret wisdom concealed in the words of Jesus.[2] It is a matter of equal importance to know the Revealer Himself.[3] Numerous sayings mention this vital aspect of knowledge.

---

[1] Doresse, The Secret Books . . . , pp. 13, 16, 43, 62, 115, mentions the accusations of the heresiologists against Nicolas, Simon Magus, the Phibionites, and others for sexual immorality, but raises the question whether the accusers were fair, honest, or accurate in their reports. He notes (p. 251) that the Chenoboskion library gives no evidence of sexual libertinism in this Gnostic community: "Nothing in these documents leads us to suppose that the Gnostics in question were addicted to licentious rites . . . ."

We should also consider what the sayings convey with regard to the content or the meaning of salvation. The various facets of the subject show a marked departure from the traditional Christian concept of salvation. "Salvation is the result not of a future act of God but of knowledge."[4] Consequently, the man who will find the interpretation of the words of "the Living Jesus . . . will not taste death."[5] Saying 3 teaches that salvation means "life," as in the Gospel of John, but unlike John (11:24, 25), whether the product of revision at this point or not, there is no resurrection in

---

[1] Preface, Sayings 1 and 2.

[2] Ibid., and Sayings 60, 78, 94, 95, 104, 110.

[3] See below on the conception of Jesus.

[4] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 119.

[5] Preface.

Thomas.[1] The Gnostic is given an exalted position; he is described as one who "will become ruler over all things."[2] Perhaps this should be related to Saying 109, in which the person who learns from Jesus is united or identified with Him. The implication is that the Gnostic shares in the exalted status of Jesus, the Revealer of "hidden things."[3] Moreover, salvation involves the assurance that Jesus is present with the Gnostic, wherever he may be or however separate from human companionship he may dwell.[4] The Gnostic experiences true being as a son of the Living One, the Father or Jesus,[5] and the knowledge of Him to which the Gnostic attains results also in "being known" by Him.[6] Notice the difference from the view of Paul, who speaks of being known by God now, but of himself only as knowing God in the future as the result of complete redemption.[7] The Gnostic comes to know himself in order to be known, which is the reverse of what Paul says![8] Finally, salvation also means knowing, entering, or finding the kingdom.[1]

---

[1] See also Sayings 18, 19, 60, 61, 78.

[2] Saying 1.

[3] Cf. Pistis Sophia, A Gnostic Miscellany, p. 193: "Ye will be fellow-kings with me in my kingdom."

[4] Sayings 79, 84, 31.

[5] Sayings 2, 38, 43, 52.

[6] Saying 2.

[7] Gal. 4:9; I Cor. 13:12.

[8] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., pp. 121, 122. Strangely, this is in contrast to what is generally true of Gnosticism. See

One question remains in this portion of our inquiry: In what sense is salvation a present reality and/or a future fulfilment? A superficial reading of the sayings may give the impression that they maintain a polarity of interests here. The Parable of the Wheat and the Tares (Saying 59) may refer to a future judgment, but it does not lay as much stress on the future as one would expect. Two sayings mention the final dissolution of the world, but say nothing about any attendant events.[2] Seven of the sayings allude to the experience of physical death,[3] but only one of them refers to a more complete understanding of one's essential being after death.[4] Here Jesus speaks of the astonishment with which after death the Gnostic will behold his pre-existent, imperishable "form" or

---

Corpus Hermeticum I. 31; VII. 2; X. 4, 15: "'God does not lack knowledge of man, but knows him perfectly and wishes to be known.'" Quoted in Bultmann, Gnosis, p. 9, note 2.

[1] Sayings 2, 23, 28, 47, 51, 110, 114, 115. See below for discussion on the concept of the kingdom.

[2] Sayings 10 and 112.

[3] Sayings 18, 21, 22, 63, 86, 90, and 104.

[4] Saying 86. The collection shows little interest in what happens to the soul at death. This contrasts sharply with Gnostic eschatology in general, which is very much concerned with the safe passage of the soul at death to the world of light. See Doresse, The Secret Books . . . , on the eschatology of: Valentinians, pp. 30, 31; Books of the Saviour (Codex Askewianus), p. 72; Gospel of Mary, p. 88; Pistis Sophia, p. 327; Poimandres, p. 277.

"image."[1]

The teaching on eschatology is only what we would expect in a Gnostic work. Scant traces of the apocalypticism of the Synoptics remain, and where such passages have been utilized they have undergone a metamorphosis so that their resultant meaning is entirely different. The Gospel of Thomas is even more radical than the Fourth Gospel in telescoping eschatology into the present. In Saying 2 the a-gnostic man is described as existing "in poverty" now; by the same token if one comes to true self-knowledge, salvation is experienced as a present reality. In Saying 23 there is an allusion to the necessity of returning to the integrity of being of the original bisexual Adam before one may enter the kingdom.[2] The return to this integrity and the entrance into the kingdom is not confined to the after-life; it is a present realization. Saying 38 deals with the same thing and also emphasizes the present aspect. Saying 43 says: "Become while you pass through." This means that while one dwells in the mundane world, he is to "become" by means of "self-knowledge" and/or finding Jesus and the interpretation of His words. In Saying 53 the disciples inquire of Jesus, "On what day will the resting place of the dead ones appear, and on what day will the new world come?" Jesus does not speak about the future, but about what has already come to pass: "That which you await has come, but you are not aware of it" (seemingly, not fully aware). Saying 60 indicates that the man who has "spent himself" (lit., "toiled") in finding the interpretation of the words of Jesus "has (already) found life." Last of all, in Saying 114 Jesus once again refuses to speak about the future with reference to a question of the disciples. They ask about the future coming of the kingdom, but Jesus emphasizes that it does not appear to men in visible form and that already "the kingdom of the Father is spread abroad over the eart[h, a]nd men do not see it." Notice the use of the present tense. The kingdom is even now dispersed over the earth. Why is it not seen? It is hidden within men, and it is not visible to men because introspective perception is essential to "seeing" or "knowing" the kingdom. If they will know, then they will realize salvation now.

---

[1] One of the problems that needs to be dealt with more fully is the relation, if any, of the "image" speculation of Saying 86 to the concepts of body, soul, and spirit.

[2] Wilson, op. cit., p. 211, says, "There are traces in Judaism of the idea that the first man was bisexual . . . ." See also G. F. Moore, Judaism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), I, 453, and W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S P C K, 1948), pp. 46, 48, 54. As we saw in chap. iii, p.115, the Naassenes held this view; Hippolytus, Ref. V. 2. So also Poimandres, parr. 16-19, Nock and Festugiere, op. cit., I, pp. 12, 13.

Conception of the Kingdom

Threefold designation.--Seven of the sayings use the term "kingdom;"[1] two have "kingdom of heaven;"[2] and seven have

---

[1] Sayings 2, 22, 23, 28, 108, 110, 114.

[2] Sayings 20, 115.

"kingdom of the Father."[1] The first two occur frequently in the Synoptic Gospels, but the third is not found anywhere in the New Testament. "Kingdom of the Father" may have been suggested by Lk. 12:32: "Do not fear, little flock, for your Father thinks it good to give the kingdom to you." No special distinction in meaning is to be made between the three terms, and the context within individual sayings determines the specific connotations wherever the terms are used.

The kingdom as discoverable within man.--Several of the sayings indicate that the kingdom is defined as an internal aspect of the self. Saying 2 speaks of the kingdom as "in your interior." In No. 22, internalization of the kingdom concept may be implied when it is said that the master of the house will not let the thief "dig into his house of his kingdom." In No. 78 the "pearl" (= kingdom) may be the equivalent of the soul as in the Acts of Thomas.[2] Saying 110 implies that the kingdom is an internal reality. The treasure is "hidden," and it takes effort to find it. It is significant that the man who finally "[found] the t[reasure]" found it "while plowing." Seen in the light of No. 60,[3] the "plowing" is particularly important. One must "toil" before the "hidden treasure" within himself can be found. However, the key saying in the collection is No. 2. Here strong emphasis is laid upon self-knowledge as the means to finding the kingdom and experiencing release from "being-in-poverty."

---

[1] Sayings 59, 78, 97, 98, 99, 100, 114.

[2] See chap. iv, p. 165; cf. James, op. cit., pp. 411-415.

[3] "Blessed is the man who has toiled; he has found life."

But what of the sayings that mention "entering the kingdom?" How may one enter what is purely internal, a matter of the ego or the self within? In Saying 23 Jesus speaks of nursing infants as "like those who enter the kingdom." In No. 100 we find: "Those who do the will of my Father . . . shall enter the kingdom of my Father." Finally, in No. 115 Jesus says that "every female who makes herself male shall enter the kingdom of heaven." May not this be inconsistent with the tendency to make the kingdom almost wholly internal? The clue to the problem lies in the fact that in the sayings where "enter the kingdom" is found "kingdom" is to be equated with the goal of salvation. In Saying 115 "entering the kingdom" means "life" to those who enter. The kingdom here is the same as the "place of life" of Saying 3, as well as the "place" and the "resting-place" found elsewhere.[1] Especially suggestive of the relationship between "the kingdom" as the goal and "the place" as the goal is Saying 66. This is the Parable of the Great Supper, and it has the unusual editorial conclusion, "The buyers and the mer[chants shall not enter] into the places of my Father."[2] Our conclusion is that "entering the kingdom" means merely achieving the goal of salvation, a realization of one's true being as "in God," a "knowing" and a "being known." The conception of the kingdom is purely spiritual and internal. It is entirely "unrelated to time or history,"[1] and thus is quite different from the New Testament view.

---

[1] See Sayings 11, 31, 52, 53, 62, 63, 66, 70, 88, 92, 100.

[2] The plural "places" may be due to a scribal error.

Conception of Jesus

Features conspicuous by their absence.--There is no historical perspective whatever with respect to the teaching of Jesus and the teaching about Jesus. That is to say, what at least seem to be the "historical" characteristics of the canonical Gospels are missing here. There is no birth story, no baptism, no temptation. We do not find any conflict stories and only the slightest hint of actual opposition by the Pharisees and Scribes to Jesus in His earthly career.[2] No miracle stories are employed; there is no demon possession or the casting out of demons. Ethical concerns have no place.[3] The kingdom is not relevant to history, and what eschatology remains is "realized eschatology." John the Baptist is mentioned, but his preaching and relation to Jesus are not described. The parables of Jesus that are employed seem to be selected to suit the overall purpose of the collection

---

[1] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., p. 113.

[2] See Sayings 40, 103.

[3] Above, p. 241.

There is no passion story and no resurrection. Only the vaguest recollections of or interest in the actual events or situations in the life of Jesus are shown. To be sure the background data of the Synoptics, and to a degree of the Fourth Gospel, are presupposed, but the stance of the canonical Gospels is not adopted by the *Gospel of Thomas*. The following discussion demonstrates this fact more fully.

The "Jesus of Thomas" and the "Jesus of history."[1]--To what extent are the two identical? The former definitely presupposes the latter, but in Thomas the historical figure becomes merely a vehicle for the teachings of the collection and a conveyance for the transcendent Living Jesus.[1] The "Jesus of history" is but a dim outline, a mere form, who stands in the shadows behind the real "Jesus of Thomas." In Saying 100 the historical Jesus is certainly understood as the one who speaks of His "mother and brothers" as "those who do the will of my Father"; yet, there is no genuine concern for the historical Jesus as such. The emphasis of the saying falls upon those who are His true kinsmen, and taken in the light of the collection's views on family relations, No. 100 further strengthens the teaching that family ties are of no consequence and are to be discarded by the Gnostic. Saying 102 is important in the same connection:

---

[1] By the "Jesus of history" we mean simply the historical Person known to us through the writings of the New Testament, primarily the Gospels, however vague or obscure the portrait of Him there may be. It is interesting to note that very early a distinction was made between the earthly Jesus and the heavenly Christ. Even for Paul there seems to have been some sort of distinction between "Christ according to the flesh" (II Cor. 5:16) and "Christ according to the spirit" (although the latter phrase is only implied by II Cor. 5:16). Walter Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956), pp. 45-50, has proposed an interesting solution to the problem of the ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς of I Cor. 12:1-3, which, if correct, would date the Gnostic distinction between the earthly Jesus and the heavenly Christ much earlier than hitherto believed. He rejects the supposition that the expression was used in the Jewish synagogue to demonstrate the Jews' strong opposition to Jesus. He also denies that it has anything to do with ecstatic utterance in which such a statement might have slipped from one's tongue unconsciously. Schmithals' position may be summed up in the following: (1) Those who uttered the curse, about which the Corinthians asked Paul for advice, were Christians who confessed "Christ as Lord," but who also "cursed Jesus." (2) These Christians were Gnostics who rejected the close connection between the heavenly, pneumatic Christ and the human Jesus. (3) The reason Paul objected so vigorously to the Corinthian Gnosis, even as it had seemed hazardous to some of the Corinthian Christians, was that it would have completely upset his theology of the cross. According to the Gnostic Christology, only the human Jesus died there, not the pneumatic Christ. (4) Schmithals finds support for his view in I John and Origen's *Contra Celsum* VI. 28. He especially refers to the latter where there is evidence of Ophitic Gnostics who refused to allow anyone to their communion

> [Jesus said,] "He who does not hate his fa[ther] and his mother as I do will not be able to be my d[isciple]; and he who does [not] love hi[s father and] his mother as I do will not be able to be my [disciple] . . . ."

If this saying stood in the original, more orthodox version of the collection, it may have been accepted simply as a paradoxical statement of the "Jesus of history." The formulation which we have here may have been an attempt to modify the

---

except they had previously "cursed Jesus." This was aimed, of course, at the earthly dwelling of the heavenly Christ and was designed to distinguish between orthodox Christians and Ophites.

[1] As in the Pistis Sophia and in the other works from Chenoboskion. So Doresse, The Secret Books . . . , p. 305.

rather harsh statement found in Lk. 14:26; but in the view of the Gnostic group which used the collection in its present form, the saying had a different meaning. Once again the "Jesus of history" is understood to be behind the statement that he "hated" his earthly father and mother, but a new element enters in when Jesus is made to speak of "loving" his father and mother. This may be a reference to His divine heritage, "father" being God the Father, and "mother" being the Holy Spirit.[1] The identity of the Holy Spirit as the Mother of Jesus, of course, is derived from the feminine gender of the Semitic word for spirit (ruah). This would fit in with the teaching of the collection that Jesus is of transcendent origin. Consequently, for the basic conception of Jesus, more importance must be attached to those sayings that point to His trans-mundane character. At first glance, Saying 29[2] may appear to be much like the Johannine writings upon the reality of the incarnation, but as we have previously observed,[3] the linguistic formulation permits a docetic interpretation of the relation of the "Jesus of Thomas" to the "Jesus of history." Sayings 19, 63, and 79, along with 29, refer to the preexistence of Jesus; yet, as the transcendent Living One, He simply "appeared" to men "in flesh," and when His revealing work was accomplished, He went away.[1]

---

[1] Origen, In Jer. hom. XV. 4. 5, cites the following agraphon from the Gospel according to the Hebrews: "Now my Mother the Holy Spirit took me and carried me to the great Mount Tabor." My trans. from Patr. Gr. XIII, col. 433. See Grant and Freedman, op. cit., pp. 189, 190.

[2] Jesus said, "I stood in the midst of the world, and I was revealed to (appeared to) them in [fles]h . . . ."

[3] See chap. v, p. 215, note 1.

Jesus and the Father.--The names used to designate Jesus and God are significant. With respect to God the name "Father" occurs eighteen times, "Living Father" twice, "God" twice, and "Lord" twice. We note the preponderant use of the name "Father," a characteristic which our document has in common with the Gospel of Truth.[2] "Father" and "Lord" are, of course, names for God. In four instances Jesus is referred to as the "Living One."[3] The "Living Jesus" is used once, in the Preface to the collection. The appellations "Living Father," "Living Jesus," and the "Living One," as well as the functions ascribed to Jesus and the Father, imply a close relationship between the two. How is that relationship defined? This is one of the more difficult aspects of the christological views of the Gospel of Thomas; yet, there are several passages that make the relation of Jesus to the Father somewhat more understandable. To begin with, we must look at each of the relevant sayings in the light of the preceding discussion on the relation of the "Jesus of Thomas" to the "Jesus of history." Our conclusion there was that the basic element in the nature of the "Jesus of Thomas" is His transcendent being. This is suggestive for the interpretation of the relation of Jesus to the Father. In Sayings 63, 66, and 100 Jesus refers to God as "my Father," thereby expressing the intimacy of the relationship which the two bear to each other. In Saying 63 Jesus indicates that He has His origin in the Father; accordingly, He is, figuratively speaking, of the same "substance" as the Father. He had been given "of the things that belong to His Father." In Saying 4 Jesus is portrayed as the One who has appeared to men; if one comes to "know" Him, then Jesus will reveal "Him who is hidden" from men, namely, God. Evidently God is "hidden" behind or in the person of the transcendent Jesus. Thus far we do not seem to be too greatly removed from the Johannine conception of the relation of Jesus to the Father:

---

[1] See Saying 39.

[2] Above, chap. iii, p.132.

[3] This recalls "the Living One" of Lk. 24:5; Rev. 1:18.

> The one who has seen me has seen the Father; . . . . Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in me? The words which I am saying to you I do not speak from myself; but the Father who remains (abides) in me is doing (accomplishing) his works. Believe me, that I (am) in the Father and the Father (is) in me . . . ."[1]

We must see, however, that Thomas goes beyond the Fourth Gospel. The latter work speaks of the essential oneness of Jesus and the Father, but it never makes an absolute identification of the two so that Jesus and the Father become indistinguishable from each other. The same cannot be said of the Gospel of Thomas. If Jesus is indeed speaking of Himself in Saying 15, then He is the Father![1] This identification would not be inconsistent with the implied docetism of Saying 29. Therefore, the collection is consistently Gnostic in affirming that the real Jesus was not and could not have been born of woman.[2] In the sayings "Father" is a term used of the highest godhead. Since this is so, Jesus, who is the Father, is the very essence of pure deity. The view of Thomas may be a radical, heterodox working out of the theme of the verses quoted above from the Fourth Gospel and of Jn. 10:30: "I and the Father are one." What we have in the sayings is a form of Modalistic Monarchianism. Hippolytus writes of Noetus of Smyrna (a precursor of Sabellius), who taught 180-200 A.D., that he "alleged that Christ was the Father Himself, and that the Father Himself was born, and suffered, and died."[3] It is obvious that we do not have the same thing in the sayings; Thomas has no place for the birth, sufferings, and death of Jesus. What does occur in our collection indicates that the highest godhead "appeared to men" as Jesus, and by this means taught them the secret wisdom essential to salvation.

---

[1] Jn. 14:9b, 10, 11a. On the relation of Jesus to the Father, cf. also Jn. 1:18; 2:16; 3:35; 5:17, 20-47; 6:27-32, 37-46, 57; 8:18, 19, 27-29, 37, 42, 54; 10:15-18, 25, 29, 30, 31-38; 12:26-28, 49, 50; 13:1, 3; 14:2, 6-14, 16, 20-31; 15:1-11, 15, 16, 23, 26; 16:3, 10, 15, 17, 23, 25-28, 32; 17:1-5, 11, 21, 25-26; 18:11; 20:17, 21.

---

[1] Hippolytus Ref. VIII. 6. Above, chap. iii, p.121.

[2] See chap. v, on "body, flesh, soul, and spirit," pp. 210-18 . The Gnostic connotations of these terms as employed in the sayings would make absurd a real incarnation of the heavenly Jesus.

[3] Contra haeresin Noeti, 1.

Saying 45 presents a difficulty at this point. What are we to make of the fact that, like the Synoptic parallels, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is considered to be a far more serious offense than blasphemy against the Father or the Son? The order Father-Son-Holy Spirit in 45 is the same as Mt. 28:19, which is an early Christian trinitarian formula. No. 45 is of a more orthodox tenor than what is found elsewhere in the collection and is thus one of its anomalous traits. We may not conjecture how or whether the trinitarian formula fits into the general pattern. Our judgment may be the same with respect to Saying 100, which may contain a disguised reference to the Holy Spirit.[1] There is this difference, however, that Saying 100 may have been so framed or included in the collection in order to point to the trans-mundane origin of Jesus, whereas with Saying 45 no such reason for its inclusion is suggested. At any rate, the community understood the exalted, real Jesus to be the Father, who alone is worthy of worship.

We come, therefore, to a more specific treatment of The essential nature of the "Jesus of Thomas."--Once more Saying 12 is instructive. Here the appellations "righteous angel" and "wise philosopher-man" are rejected, and it is important to see that no descriptive title is given to Him because He is so incomparable that no language can be found that is sufficient. We have already mentioned His preexistence,[1] which is necessarily correlative to His identity with the Father. In Saying 105 He is said to be sinless. Since He was not "born of woman,"[2] it logically follows that He could not be guilty of evil. The collection does not define sin or evil as moral rebellion against the will of a righteous God. It is rather the product of one dwelling in the "poverty" of the "body" or "flesh."[3] Jesus "appeared in flesh,"[4] but He did not "become flesh,"[5] and so He was not guilty of wrong.

---

[1] Above, p. 254.

Saying 18 implies that Jesus is the beginning and the end.[6] What is meant by this is that He is the origin of all things and He is the goal toward which all things tend. Saying 79 makes the same idea more explicit and adds a pantheistic element:

> I am the Light which is above them all (= all lights?).
> I am the Totality out of whom the Totality came
> forth and to whom the Totality has reached.
> Split the wood, (and) I am there; lift the stone,
> and you will find me there.

Jesus is the fullness of true existence, and apart from Him one's being is negated by death. The expression "out of whom the Totality came forth" indicates a theory of emanations of creatures, as in the Gospel of Truth.[1] The supposition of Grant and Freedman that the doctrine of creation is implied in Saying 79 is inconsistent with the collection as a whole (with the exception of Saying 11).[2] Furthermore, there is nothing in 79 itself to suggest creation in the Biblical sense; instead the very phraseology indicates a succession of emanations from the depths of the deity and their ultimate return to the deity. Concerning the last part of No. 79, "Split the wood, (and) I am there; lift the stone, and you will find me there," there appears what seems to be a doctrine of pantheism. However, pan-entheism would perhaps be a better word, for Thomas does not teach the absolute immanence of God as the term pantheism indicates. The saying seems to be inconsistent with the theory that "spirit" is antithetical to "matter"; yet, it simply states the ubiquitous nature of the deity, but not the identity of the deity with the material substance through which He manifests Himself. Thus, He may be the animating principle of all living things, including trees and stones which to ancient men were full of "soul" as well as man himself.

---

[1] See above, p. 255, and Sayings 19 and 63.

[2] Above, pp. 121, 258, and Saying 15.

[3] Above, chap. v, pp. 210-18 , and chap. vi, p. 241.

[4] Saying 29.

[5] Jn. 1:14; I Jn. 4:2, 3.

[6] Rev. 21:6.

The role of Jesus in relation to man.--Numerous allusions have already been made with regard to the role or function of Jesus in relation to man. Here we shall bring the evidence together in summary fashion. Jesus is indeed the Teacher of secret knowledge.[1] He is the Revealer of life-giving truth,[2] and as the Revealed One, the "Living One," He Himself imparts life to those who seek it.[3] He is the Object and Goal of all true seeking.[4] In His relation to man Jesus may even be called the Salvation-Bringer, but the salvation which He brings is from the illusory existence of the sense world to life as pure spirit. Yet, it is significant that He is never spoken of as Saviour; σωτήρ and σωτηρία occur in the *Gospel of Truth*,[5] but never in the *Gospel of Thomas*. Perhaps this is the result of a conscious attempt to disassociate the role of Jesus as defined in the collection from any conception of His being the Saviour in terms of what He does (or has done). What is postulated of Jesus suggests a kind of mysticism in which the Gnostic's salvation is nothing else than a fusion of his being with ultimate Being itself, that is, with God. This *ecstasis*, of course, is realized in the *now* of existence: "Look upon the Living One while you live, that you may not die, and seek to see Him."[6] Quite unlike the Jesus of the canonical Gospels,

---

[1] See chap. iii, p.130, and Grobel, op. cit., pp. 38, 40.

[2] Grant and Freedman, op. cit., pp. 177, 178.

---

[1] Preface.

[2] *Ibid*., and Sayings 4, 5, 17, 39, 64, 94, 109.

[3] Sayings 38, 61, 94, 95, 112a.

[4] Sayings 79, 112b.

[5] 16:37-40, in Grobel, *op. cit*., p. 36.

[6] Saying 61. See above on "eschatology," p. 247.

"the Jesus of this Gospel does not bring about the redemption of his followers by means of his life work, but rather by what he is."[1]

Summary and Conclusion

We have found that the world-view of Thomas is not wholly consistent, although in essentials it is basically dualistic. It is also not too clear in its view of man, but, as we have seen, a Valentinian-type anthropology would best explain the difficulties. With regard to the concepts of salvation and eschatology, we have found a radical de-historicization of both. Man's objective is to find "repose in God." The means whereby he finds it is "knowledge"--of the words of Jesus and of Jesus Himself. To be saved means to be endowed with immortality or to experience "true being." Almost no interest in the time aspect of salvation is shown, for there is no basic difference between one's status now and after death. As for the view of the kingdom, we found it to be wholly interior to man. It is external to man ("in your exterior")[2] only in the sense that it is within other men who themselves are external to one's own self. There is no reference to history with respect to the kingdom, as also with the related concepts of salvation and eschatology. The portrait of Jesus we have found to be radically different from the

---

[1] Piper, "The Gospel of Thomas," p. 24.

[2] Saying 2.

Synoptics. There has been a transformation of both Jesus and His teachings. He is the Supreme Celestial Being, and His teachings are a secret celestial wisdom. He _is_ the Father. He is the "All" or the "Totality" of all living beings--the origin of all and the destiny of all. He is everywhere, even in stones and trees, though He is not to be identified with matter. Through what He is, Jesus gives life to those who find Him, and when they find Him, they experience a mystic union with Him.

From the foregoing exposition it is difficult to see how anyone could deny the Gnostic character of the _Gospel of Thomas_. Professor Piper has declared the work to be pre-Gnostic,[1] but in nearly every feature it bears direct relation to Gnosticism. It is Gnostic in its view of the world, of man, of salvation, and of eschatology. It is typically Gnostic in that historical time has no meaning. The New Testament conception of the kingdom is wholly distorted into a quality of the true self within, or becomes but a symbol of the goal of salvation, which is union with God. Even the sayings which are the most closely related to the canonical sayings have been frequently revised in the direction of Gnostic theology, and a careful study of the entire collection shows that they were intended to be interpreted in a gnosticizing fashion.[2]

---

[1] Otto A. Piper, "A New Gospel?" pp. 96-99.

[2] See chap. iv, p. 182.

As for the view of Jesus, we are clearly in the realm of Christian Gnosticism, but it seems that we are farther downstream than, for instance, the Gospel of Truth. The latter work shows a much greater interest in the "Jesus of history" and a deep appreciation for the death of Jesus. Not so with the Gospel of Thomas. Theologically speaking, our work throws practically no light on the New Testament itself, whereas it can hardly be understood without the New Testament as its starting point. Nevertheless, the sayings give us important and direct insight into the views of some of the second and third century Gnostics.

CONCLUSION

In the INTRODUCTION some fourteen questions were raised pertaining to the Gospel of Thomas. In greater or lesser degree all but one of them have been touched upon in the foregoing study. In the discussion which follows, a resume of the more important answers to those questions shall be given, along with the distinctive features of the collection's theology. Areas for further research beyond the scope of this thesis shall be given, and finally, the value of Thomas as indicated by the study shall be set forth.

Summary of major findings.--Chapter I gives a fresh translation based upon independent study, which at the same time has the merit of taking into account the works of other scholars whose translations of Thomas have been made public. This work has the advantage of being a critical translation, with linguistic and grammatical data discussed where necessary. I have included the conjectures and opinions of other scholars, as well as my own. The reader is also aided by interpretative notes where problems of translation make them necessary. The value of the translation, of course, will be assessed by students of Coptic. It is to be hoped that in many instances there have been provided new insights into the meaning of obscure passages.

With regard to the comparison in Chapter II between

Thomas and the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, several important conclusions have been reached. In some instances evidence of a free manipulation of the text in the process of copying and translation was found. In others, it is plain that the Greek text(s) from which the Coptic is derived was translated accurately. The comparison has also shown that the text-tradition of Thomas and that of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri is not the same. At least Papyrus 1:5 and G. Th. 31 may be dependent on a common ancestor. Finally, it has been proposed on the basis of the evidence that the collection must be dated somewhere in the second century, perhaps the middle thereof.

In the second part of the study an attempt was made to establish the context of the sayings by means of a literary analysis and comparative study with related literature. Structurally speaking, nothing of value was found except a few minor clues here and there. The overall construction of the work has no special significance; no hidden meaning in the order of the sayings can be found. What limited groupings occur in a catch-word sequence were probably framed merely to aid the learner to remember the sayings. The strong literary ties with various strata of literature, including the canonical New Testament, the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, and the sayings that have parallels in the patristic literature, militate against the view that these limited groupings suggest a stage of oral transmission prior to the actual literary composition of the collection. The evidence suggests that the chief use of

Thomas involved instruction of catechumens within the religious community.

With respect to literary and sectarian affinities, it was shown that Thomas, while demonstrating some contact with Jewish or Jewish-Christian teachings, basically transcends and modifies such elements. Various theological motifs of Thomas are parallel to those found in the Gospel of the Egyptians (the teachings on sex) and the Naassene discourse of Hippolytus. Thomas is familiar with the cosmological and christological ideas of the Naassenes. Especially in christology is the relationship important. Chapter VI discusses this aspect of the document more fully. The teaching on sexual abstinence is also similar, as is the emphasis on self-knowledge and the interiorization of the kingdom concept. The strong antipathy of the Naassenes for Jewish institutional elements is echoed in the sayings. Next, various sayings were compared with Poimandres, the Gospel of Truth, and the Pistis Sophia. With respect to the first, Thomas shares the view of the nature of man and his tragic involvement in the suffering and delusion of the sense-world. Also in evidence are terminological and conceptual parallels with the Gospel of Truth. Common to both are the use of the terms "Father," "Totality," "drunkenness," "beginning and end," "place," and "rest." One of the more important elements that Thomas shares with the Pistis Sophia is the notion of mystic union with the deity, an important

Gnostic concept. Finally, it was determined that the collection was used by the Manichaeans, and certain connections with Manichaean literature demonstrate that Thomas probably originated in Syria. Most of the sayings studied at this point, in Chapter III, were the more syncretistic, Gnostic-type.

Chapter IV examined the relationship to and use of canonical materials, as well as the employment of numerous agrapha. It was ascertained that very early sayings traditions are exceedingly rare. Only a few examples step forth that may be judged to be parallel or prior to the Synoptic tradition. Most of the sayings that are similar to the ones found in the canonical Gospels are clearly secondary in nature, demonstrating positive knowledge of the canonical text. Quite significant was the finding that the most numerous group among the Synoptic-type utterances were the ones showing tendentious theological alterations. This fact verifies the judgment that one is not to expect too much from Thomas in giving extremely ancient sayings. The fact that so many of the sayings were altered intentionally also amplifies the Gnostic character of the work as a whole. The non-canonical agrapha exhibit similar characteristics and show that they are the product of a people who, at least after Irenaeus and the crystallization of orthodox theology, were judged to be on the periphery of the Christian movement. At the same time it should be seen that in its initial stages the Gospel of Thomas may not have been transparently Gnostic to everyone and may have been acceptable to many people within the second century church. The findings of Chapter II verify this opinion, for the comparison with the Oxyrhynchus Papyri shows that there was an earlier, more orthodox version of Thomas. When one adds to this the attempt of the sayings to sound like the Jesus of the Synoptics, the distinct impression is given that the work in its earlier form did not appear so heretical as it seems to us.

The third part of the thesis examined more specifically the relationship of Thomas to Gnostic movements in general and sought to ascertain the features peculiar to the sayings. It was shown that Thomas shares with Gnosticism many common concepts and terms. It presupposes a radical dualism in its world-view. It expresses the belief that man is essentially "spirit" trapped in "flesh." The anthropology of the sayings is basically Gnostic, and is closest to Valentinianism. The assumption of a tri-partite division of man into "body," "soul," and "spirit" best explains the sayings that have to do with the view of man. The concept of knowledge is peculiarly Gnostic. The wisdom of Thomas is esoteric; only a few are capable of knowing. The rest of mankind is doomed to oblivion. Self-knowledge is central, as one would expect in a Gnostic writing. Cognition and true being occur simultaneously, and both the positive and negative aspects of Gnosis are mentioned. So much for the evidence in Chapter V.

In the final chapter the basic theology in Thomas was formulated under several headings. Seemingly, inconsistencies in cosmology are in evidence. Then the anthropology of Thomas was examined in greater detail and more evidence was set forth leading in the direction of Valentinianism. Still further, the sayings present a view of salvation and eschatology whereby there is a radical de-historicization of both, as well as of the conception of the kingdom of God. The portrait of Jesus is one in which the historical figure is but the vehicle for the exalted celestial Christ. Here is a kind of modalism in the conception of Jesus. The notion is quite strange and peculiar to us, but not at all to the Gnostic who could see no possibility of a real incarnation of the divine Son in human flesh. It was concluded that Thomas is a Gnostic work throughout, in its conception of the world, man, salvation, the kingdom, eschatology (in part), and christology.

Unique features of the theology in Thomas.--Some of these traits may be considered to be quite distinctive, considered in the light of what one would expect to appear in a Gnostic work.

1. The first trait that is most noticeable is the complete absency of myth. It seems that no need was felt for mythological formulae in a work of this type.[1]

2. Another peculiar feature is the mixture of Gnostic

---

[1] Above, chap. v, p. 212.

anthropology and the Greek doctrine of ideas (of the soul) in the same work.[1] The latter teaching, of course, is Platonic in origin.[2] The implication of this mixture may be that only the later copies of _Thomas_ contained the Gnostic anthropology, although it is quite possible that the earliest editions included both elements.

3. One notes also the strange, new way of speaking of the goal or state of salvation by the use of the terms "place" and "rest." These concepts are internalized in a Gnostic fashion, but they seem to have a Philonic and Aristotelian background.[3]

4. Saying 2 introduces another unusual aspect of the sayings. It speaks of one "knowing himself" in order "to be known," apparently by God! This contrasts with the customary Gnostic view that God knows man fully and desires to reveal Himself to man.[4]

5. Still further, we are struck by the fact that the sayings exhibit no interest whatever in speculation on the destiny of the soul after death. The eschatology of other Gnostics is barely alluded to here.[5]

---

[1] Sayings 85 and 86. See above, chap. iii, p. 137, note 1. cf. also Doresse, _The Secret Books . . ._, p. 377.

[2] Plato _Permenides_, _Sophist_, _Philebus_, _Phaedrus_, _Symposium_.

[3] Above, chap. vi, p. 238.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 246.

[5] _Ibid._, p. 247.

6. With respect to the doctrine of salvation, *Thomas* sets forth the view that one must strive for salvation through Gnosis, whereas Gnosticism usually thinks of salvation as a gift from God by means of revelation.[1]

7. One also views with interest the inversion of the Stoic idea of the cosmos as a "body" into the Gnostic notion of the cosmos as a "corpse." If the cosmos *is* a "body," then it is a "*dead* body," even as the body of man![2]

8. Then, too, one must not overlook the way in which Saying 30 speaks of "flesh" or "body" as "this poverty" into which "spirit" has been placed. Here we confront the intriguing possibility that the "poverty" of Jesus mentioned by Paul in II Cor. 8:9 may be more than a mere economic term!

Areas that remain to be dealt with in the future.--The textual critic may find of interest the "Western" readings of *Thomas*. Perhaps the whole problem of the "Western Text" should be reopened in the light of the readings in the collection. Also not without value would be a monograph dealing with the inconsistencies in *Thomas* as they pertain to earlier and later recensions. The evidence at this point is limited, but the Oxyrhynchus Papyri are suggestive and offer some valuable clues. An interesting question here has to do with the relative orthodoxy of the original collection. How much did it differ from the Coptic version now in our possession? We should also be concerned with defining more precisely the relationship of the sayings to Jewish ideas and institutions and Greek philosophical concepts. Of exceptional value would be a more complete comparison with the Gospel of Truth and the other works from the Chenoboskion library. Students of early Christianity eagerly await the publication of the majority of the remaining texts which lie in the Coptic Museum in Cairo. As stated before, however, what is needed most of all is a detailed, exhaustive commentary on every saying in the Gospel of Thomas that would include all available data--linguistic, Biblical, patristic, rabbinic, and philosophical.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 238, note 1.

[2] Above, chap. v, p. 208.

The value of Thomas in the light of this thesis.--At this point it is necessary to estimate the importance of the collection as it pertains to the matter of the sources of the Synoptic Gospels. The sayings have excited considerable interest because some have thought that in them are to be found elements pointing to traditions prior to the canonical Gospels or parallel to and independent of them. When the edition of Harper and Brothers of The Gospel according to Thomas was published, statements such as the following were made:

> Related to the logia of the Synoptic Gospels and apparently sharing the same or similar sources, the parables and other sayings in THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS are open to consideration as possibly containing genuine words of Jesus heretofore

unknown.[1]

> A few of those [sayings] entirely unfamiliar may be as authentic as some in our canonical Gospels.[2]

First it should be reaffirmed that Thomas offers little or no help with regard to the sources of the Synoptic Gospels. Chapter IV demonstrated direct dependency upon the canonical New Testament; moreover, the sayings show familiarity with more than one text tradition of the New Testament, using "Western" and "Alexandrian" readings! In addition, the overwhelming majority of the sayings, including the new agrapha, exhibit a strong Gnostic tendency. These facts preclude the possibility that Thomas may contain some authentic sayings of Jesus that somehow escaped the canonical Gospels. In spite of his great erudition, Gilles Quispel has been much too hasty in assessing the importance of the sayings in this respect.[3] To distort Saying 78, one looks for "pearls," but instead finds a "burden."

More significant is the consideration of the sayings in relation to Gnosticism. A question that comes to mind immediately has to do with placing Thomas next to its closest kin in the stream of evolving Gnostic thought. In some respects it is closer to Ptolemy's Letter to Flora,[1] which is to be dated in the first half of the second century. That is to say that both documents present a basically Gnostic world-view while showing no interest in expansive myths. The Letter to Flora adopts a critical attitude toward the Old Testament whereby it accepts, for example, the Decalogue as coming from the intermediate "Just God." The teaching of Jesus the Saviour is the criterion for judging what is partially valid in the Old Testament, as it is also in certain ways a fulfilment of portions of the Old Testament. Thomas, however, has an aversion for the Old Testament as such and shows no tendency to judge some features even as partially acceptable; yet, Thomas shares with the Letter to Flora a profound respect for the teachings of Jesus, although the sayings radically distort Jesus' teachings. In other ways the sayings are farther down the line in the direction of the Pistis Sophia. This is seen especially in the radical way in which both documents specify the ultimate destiny of the Gnostic to be mystic union with the heavenly Jesus. The mixed character of Thomas is best explained by the progressive revisions through which it went. In its earlier form it may have been much closer to Ptolemy's Letter.

---

[1] Publisher's statement on the "dust jacket" of The Gospel according to Thomas.

[2] Harvey K. McArthur, ibid.

[3] Cf. "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament."

What are we to make of the traces of Naassene and Valentinian elements in the sayings? The presence of both but the lack of subservience to these or any other systems suggests one of two possibilities: (1) a casual borrowing from both; (2) Gnosis in a stage prior to Naassene and Valentinian speculation, but related to both. If the second is true, and if the Naassenes are as early as they seem to be, then Thomas goes back to a form of Gnosticism as early as the late first century. I choose the second possibility as the background for the original form of the collection.

---

[1] Epiphanius Haer. XXXIII. 3-7.

One may ask what the author of the Pastoral Epistles and Ignatius of Antioch would have thought of the Gospel of Thomas. The former would certainly have approved of its absence of "myths and endless genealogies."[1] He would also have had no objection to the liberal attitude on dietary restrictions. However, the sexual asceticism and the christology of Thomas would have been rejected, along with the attitude toward the Old Testament, the de-historicization of the concept of salvation, and the lack of any ethical emphasis. So far as Ignatius is concerned, he would have reacted most strongly against the Gnostic christology of Thomas. The semi-creedal formulations of Ignatius are positive in defining the nature of Christ: He was really God; He was born of Mary; He experienced a real passion in the time of Pontius Pilate, was buried, and was literally and actually raised from the dead.[1] This was central to Ignatius' point of view and runs counter to the christology of Thomas.

---

[1] I Tim. 1:4.

How does the collection fit into the picture of Gnosticism drawn by the church fathers? Here one must say two things: (1) The two (Thomas and the patristic literature) properly speaking complement each other. The sayings emphasize a side of Gnosticism neglected by the patristic sources; namely, the non-mythological aspect of Gnostic thought. (2) However, we would find it difficult to discern some of the implications of Thomas without the benefit of the patristic literature. The latter are still indispensable in the study of Gnosticism.

Here should be added a statement on an issue raised in Chapter III. It has to do with the use of the sayings in the teaching of catechumens in the religious community. Certainly the earlier form of the sayings was used by persons who were not interested in Gnostic speculation as such; in fact, even in the more fully gnosticized version mythological speculation is subsidiary to the primary interests of the collection. Yet, we may conclude that the sayings are so generally Gnostic, without any special orientation toward the Gnostic schools or systems, that they could have been used and adapted by persons with varying notions.

---

[1] Cf. Eph. 18-19; Magn. 11; Trall. 9-10; Phil. 8:2; Smyrn. 1.

Finally, what does the Gospel of Thomas suggest with respect to current studies of Gnosticism? It is my opinion that it shows that one must not make too rigid a definition of Gnosticism according to the system-makers of the second century. For instance, the view of Dodd[1] and Wilson[2] that Gnosticism should be defined in the narrow sense according to the systems explained and refuted by Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius is not adequate for a full understanding either of Gnosticism or of Thomas. The interpretations of Jonas[3] and Bultmann[4] are much more adequate. They have deduced that the criterion for the definition of what is and what is not Gnostic is "the dualistic-anticosmic spirit."[5] This spirit is found in writings that are both mythological and non-mythological in nature. It seems to me that Jonas and Bultmann have penetrated to the essence lying at the basis of the mythical hodgepodge that is the confusion and the despair of the person just beginning the study of Gnosticism, and the Gospel of Thomas emphatically corroborates their analysis.

---

[1] The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 97-103.

[2] Wilson, op. cit., p. 68.

[3] Gnostic Religion, p. 33, and Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist, I, 140-56.

[4] Theology of the New Testament, I, 165.

[5] Jonas, Gnostic Religion, p. 33.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF COMPARISON OF THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS WITH THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

I. Papyrus 654 and G. Th. Preface-Saying 6

- A. Pap. 654: Preface // G. Th. Preface
  1. 654 does not have room for the full name Didymus-Judas-Thomas as occurs in the Coptic text.
  2. 654 uses the dative of the name of Thomas, whereas the Coptic has the name Didymus-Judas-Thomas as subject of the verb "recorded."
- B. Pap. 654:1 // G. Th. 1

  The last half of 654 has: "and whenever he finds [he will be amazed and having] been amazed he will reign an[d having reigned he will] rest." This differs from G. Th. 1: "and whenever he finds he will be disturbed, and whenever he is disturbed he will be amazed, and he will become ruler over all."
- C. Pap. 654:2 // G. Th. 2
  1. 654 has "those who lead us;" but Thomas has "those who lead you."
  2. Differences in phraseology:
     - a) 654 has "kingdom of heaven," whereas G. Th. has merely "kingdom."

b) 654 has "the kin[gdom of heaven] is within you," whereas G. Th. has "the kingdom is in your interior and in your exterior."

3. The Greek text (654) has the significant addition ["the beasts t]hat are under the earth [or upon the earth . . ."].

4. 654 has "the fish of the se[a, these (are) the ones which preced]e you," whereas G. Th. has "the fish will precede you."

5. 654 has "whosoever knows himself will fin[d this (the kingdom) and he will be known.] Know yourselves [and you will understand that you are sons] of the [Living] Father." G. Th. simply says, "Whenever you know yourselves, then you will be known, and you will understand that you are sons of the Living Father."

D. Pap. 654:3 // G. Th. 3

Thomas omits "and the last first."

E. Pap. 654:4 // G. Th. 4

654 has an addition at the end not found in Thomas: "and buried which [will not be raised"]

F. Pap. 654:5 // G. Th. 5

1. 654 has ["for all things are manifest o]f truth befor[e heaven"], while Thomas omits the phrase "of truth."

2. Thomas adds at the end "and there is nothing covered which will be left without uncovering it."

G. Pap. 654:6 // G. Th. 6

Not enough of the Greek text exists to make any extensive comparison, although enough Greek letters are visible to show that 654:6 was essentially the same as G. Th. 6.

II. Papyrus 1 and G. Th. 27-34, 79b

A. Pap. 1:1 // G. Th. 27

1. Thomas omits "and" at the beginning of the clause "and then you shall see to throw the chip . . . ."

2. Pap. 1:1 has, literally, "and then you will see to throw out the chip, the one in the eye of your brother," whereas Thomas has, "then you will see (how) to throw the chip out of the eye of your brother."

B. Pap. 1:2 // G. Th. 28

1. Pap. 1:2 has "kingdom of God," but Thomas simply has "kingdom."

2. Thomas omits the conjunction "and" between the parallel members (These omissions make a rigid parallelism in G. Th. 28).

C. Pap. 1:3 // G. Th. 29

1. Thomas omits the conjunction "and" from the clause "and I found no one among them thirsty."

2. There is a minor difference in word order, which is of no special significance.
3. Pap. 1:3 uses the present active indicative for the verb "grieve," whereas Thomas uses the I perfect.

D. Pap. 1:4 // G. Th. 30

Not enough of the Greek text exists for a careful study. Only ["in thi]s poverty" is visible.

E. Pap. 1:5a // G. Th. 31

1. Pap. 1:5a has "wherever there are two" // Thomas "Where there are three godly ones."
2. Pap. 1:5a has "they are not without God" // Thomas "they are in God."
3. Pap. 1:5a has "and where there is one only" // Thomas "where there are two or one."
4. Note the omission of "and" by Thomas at the beginning of the phrase in 3. above.

F. Pap. 1:5b // G. Th. 79b

1. The order of the two collections is different at this point.
2. Thomas reverses the parallel members of the saying.

G. Pap. 1:6 // G. Th. 32

No essential variants are evident.

H. Pap. 1:7 // G. Th. 33

Thomas omits the word "top" from the phrase "upon the *top* of a high mountain."

I. Pap. 1:8 // *G. Th*. 34

1. Pap. 1:8 has the plural for "what things" but *Thomas* has the singular "what."

2. Pap. 1:8 has the present tense "you hear" while *Thomas* has I future "you will hear."

III. Papyrus 655 and *G. Th*. 37-40

A. Pap. 655:1 // *G. Th*. 37

1. Pap. 655:1 extends to 18 lines, whereas *Thomas* at this point is only 3 lines in length.

2. *G. Th*. 37 is parallel to 655:1 only to line 7. Even then it omits "neither for your[food,] what you shall e[at, nor] for [your] cl[othing] what . . . ."

B. Pap. 655:2 // *G. Th*. 38

1. Pap. 655:2 has "when" (2 occurrences), whereas *Thomas* has "on what day' (2 occurrences).

2. Pap. 655:2 has "whenever you strip yourselves *and are not ashamed*" // *Thomas* "whenever you strip yourselves *of your shame*."

3. Pap. 655:2 has "His disciples say (historical present) *to him*" // *Thomas* "His disciples said."

4. Pap. 655:2 has "he says" (historical present) // *Thomas* "Jesus said."

C. Pap. 655:3 // *G. Th*. 39

There is no extant Greek parallel, but the number of lines missing from the Greek fragment are filled in perfectly by translating the Coptic text back into Greek.

D. Pap. 655:4 // G. Th. 40

1. Thomas omits "and" from the clause "and they hid them."
2. Pap. 655:4 has "to the ones entering" // Thomas "those who wished to go in."
3. Pap. 655:4 has "they did not open," but Thomas has "nor did they permit."

IV. Resume

A. Total number of actual parallels (including very small fragments) = 19.

B. The Coptic varies in the use of the I perfect in the introductory formulae (Jesus said) from the prevailing use of the present active indicative (Jesus says) in all three of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

C. Total number of variants (not counting No. 2 above) = 38.

D. Total number of parallel sayings in which there is at least one variant (excluding No. 2 above) = 16.

E. Number of significant "expansions" in Thomas not found in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri = 2.

F. Number of significant "omissions" from Thomas found only in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri = 9 (possibly 10).

APPENDIX B

MONAXOC

The use of μοναχός in the *Gospel of Thomas* raises two interesting questions: (1) What does it mean? (2) What does it indicate with respect to the community which compiled and/or used the sayings? We should begin by mentioning that it is futile to look for clues in monastic origins in Egypt. For one thing, *Thomas* probably originated in Syria and not in Egypt.[1] For another, so far as we are able to tell, monasticism in Egypt did not get underway until long after the initial copies of *Thomas* were made.[2] Nor can anything be made of a relationship with the Therapeutae known through the works of Philo.[1]

---

[1] Above, chap. iii, p.141.

[2] Adolf von Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, trans. James Moffatt (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905), II, 304-08, summarizes our knowledge of second century Christianity in Egypt under six brief points, none of which have anything to do with early monastic origins. Ernest A. Wallis Budge, in his "Introduction" to the *Paradise of the Holy Fathers*, p. xli, mentions a single tradition that in the reign of Antoninus Pius (138-61 A.D.) "an abbot called Frontonius, hating the world and longing for solitude, collected seventy brethren and led them to the Nitrian Desert, where they cultivated the ground, and lived exceedingly austere lives (*Acta Sanctorum*, April 14)." Whether this is a valid tradition cannot be ascertained. Other than this we have the anchoritic movement, of which the tradition concerning Paul of Thebes is the earliest. He is supposed to have lived (born c. 150, died c. 249-c. 270 A.D.) before Anthony. The latter is regarded as the real founder of Egyptian monasticism, although he established no permanent order himself and spent his last years as a solitary ascetic. Anthony's dates are c. 250-c. 355 A.D. It is also clear that cenobitic monasticism can have nothing to do with the use of

There may be some validity to the view of Walter Till on the meaning of the word:

> "Solitary" translates here μοναχός, which cannot have its usual meaning "monks" in this early text, but seems rather to mean "the lonely one"--not so much in the sense of a hermit or an anchorite but of a person standing alone with the advanced development of his knowledge (gnosis) who, therefore, is not one of the mass.[2]

The real clue, however, lies in the attitude of the sayings toward marriage, which is held in common with the Gospel of the Egyptians.[3] Saying 16 (elsewhere only 51 and 77 use the word μοναχός) itself suggests the correct translation:

> Jesus said, "Perhaps men think that I have come to cast peace over the world, and do not know that I have come to cast divisions over the earth,--a fire, a sword, a war. For five shall be in a house; three shall be against two and two against three, the father against the son and the son against the father, and they shall stand, they who are μοναχός.

This saying is clearly a modification of Mt. 10:34-35 // Lk.

μοναχός in Thomas, for Pachomius did not found the monastery of Tabenna in Upper Egypt until c. 320 A.D. The date for the original of the Gospel of Thomas is probably the mid-second century. See above, chap. ii, p. 86.

[1] Philo *De vita contemplativa*.

[2] "New Sayings of Jesus in the Recently Discovered Coptic 'Gospel of Thomas,'" *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XLI (1959), 452, note 2.

[3] Above, chap. iii, p.107.

12:51-53. The connection with Luke is the strongest, but the peculiar trait of the saying is the last line which changes the emphasis of the utterance entirely. It should be noticed that there is a contrast between those who live in a house or family (HEI can mean "family" as well as "house") and the "μοναχός one." Only the latter "shall stand" because he is μοναχός, unencumbered by marriage and its attendant ills. When this is seen in the light of Saying 63, the translation of μοναχός is obvious: "Whenever one is desolate (= celibate?), he shall die in light; but whenever one is divided (by marriage? I Cor. 7:34), he shall die in darkness." The μοναχός one is "alone" or "solitary," not in the sense of being a hermit, but in terms of sexual relations in marriage and in terms of family connections. For the Gnostic, then, entrance into the kingdom involves being "desolate" or "celibate," (Saying 63) abolishing sexual distinctions in the higher realization that there is neither male nor female (Saying 23), "standing alone" as an integrated self-hood (Saying 16). Therefore, it would seem best to translate μοναχός as a "single" or "alone one" or "solitary" who has refrained from marriage and the divisions which marriage brings. This fits in with the sexual-asceticism of the document as a whole.[1]

---

[1] Having already reached the above conclusion it was interesting to find that Grant and Freedman, op. cit., pp. 136, 137, comment on Saying 16: "Those who 'stand' . . . are those who have broken their ties with earthly families and are 'single ones' . . . ."

Moreover, the proximity of Sayings 50 and 51 to each other adds to the likelihood of the above interpretation. Saying 50 speaks of "two making peace with each other in the same family (or "house")." If they do so, then they can "move mountains." May this not mean that the "two" in "the same family" may be husband and wife? And may not the startling nature of their "making peace with each other" be a matter of transcending the ordinary relations of husband and wife by voluntary sexual asceticism? Such may well be the meaning beneath the surface appearance of the words, and this view is strengthened by the phrasing of Saying 51: "Blessed are the solitary (single) (μοναχός) and elect ones; for you shall find the kingdom, because you came from it (and) you shall return to it." The arrangement is no accident. The nearness of the two sayings to each other would not only be an aid to the memory of the catechumen but would also help in understanding their meaning.

Perhaps we should give here a brief exposition of Saying 77, which is the third of the sayings in which μοναχός occurs: "There are many standing at the door, but it is the single ones (μοναχός) who shall enter the bridal chamber." Primarily this seems to be reminiscent of the Parable of the Ten Maidens in Mt. 25:1-13. As elsewhere in Thomas, the eschatological element of Matthew is lacking. While many would go through the door, only the μοναχός ones (sexual ascetics) "shall enter the bridal chamber," which latter expression must be a figure for the "place" within oneself which one must know in order to realize that he is "a son of the Living Father" (Sayings 2 and 52). This "place" within oneself, or "the bridal chamber," is symbolic of the condition of salvation; hence, only the sexual ascetics will be saved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Allberry, C. R. C. (ed.). *A Manichaean Psalm-Book*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.

Anson, Peter F. *The Quest of Solitude*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1932.

The Babylonian Talmud. Edited by I. Epstein. London: Soncino Press, 1935, Vol. III.

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.

Bell, H. ~~Idris.~~ *Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

Bornkamm, Guenther. "mysterion," *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1942, IV, 809-34.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. 3 Auflage. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.

_______. *Gnosis*. Vol. V: *Bible Key Words*. Edited and translated by J. R. Coates. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952.

_______. *Primitive Christianity*. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.

_______. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.

Burkitt, Francis Crawford. *Church and Gnosis*. Cambridge: University Press, 1932.

Chadwick, Henry, and Oulton, John Ernest Leonard (eds.). Alexandrian Christianity. Vol. II: The Library of Christian Classics. Edited by John Baillie and others. 26 vols. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.

Clement d'Alexandrie. Extraits de Theodote. Edited and translated by F. Sagnard. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1948.

Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo. Edited by Pahor Labib. Cairo: Government Press, 1956, Vol. I.

The Coptic Gospel of Thomas, A Gnostic Source of Unknown Sayings of Jesus from Chenoboskion. An English translation prepared by the New Testament Seminar of Princeton Theological Seminary, May, 1958. Unpublished.

The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic. Edited by George W. Horner. 7 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911-24.

Cross, Frank Leslie (ed.). The Jung Codex. London: Mowbray, 1955.

Crum, Walter Ewing. A Coptic Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.

Cullmann, Oscar. Le Probleme Litteraire et historique du roman Pseudo-Clementin. Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan, 1930.

Danielou, Jean. Theologie du judeo-christianisme. Tournai, Belg.: Desclee & Co., 1958.

Davidson, William L. The Stoic Creed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907.

Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London: SPCK, 1948.

Dodd, C. H. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

______. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.

Doresse, Jean. Les livres secrets des gnostiques d'Egypte. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1958.

______. The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics. Translated by Philip Mairet. London: Hollis and Carter, 1960.

Evangelium Veritatis. Edited and translated by Michel Malinine, Henri-Charles Puech, and Gilles Quispel. Zuerich: Rascher Verlag, 1956.

Faye, Eugene de. *Gnostiques et gnosticisme*. 2^{e} Edition Augmentee. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1925.

Ferm, Vergilius (ed.). *A History of Philosophical Systems*. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1950.

Findlay, Adam Fyfe. *Byways in Early Christian Literature*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1923.

Fuller, B. A. G. *A History of Philosophy*. 2 vols. Rev. Ed. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1945.

Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909-38.

The Gospel according to Thomas. Edited and translated by A. Guillaumont, Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, Walter Till, and Yassah Abd Al Masih. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Grant, Robert M., and Freedman, David Noel. *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1960.

Grenfell, Bernard P., and Hunt, Arthur S. (eds.). *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus*. London: Oxford University Press, 1904.

Grobel, Kendrick (trans.). *The Gospel of Truth*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Groton, W. M. "Mystery, Mysteries," *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922, II, 49-62.

Harnack, Adolf. *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. Translated by James Moffatt. New York: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1905, Vol. II.

_______. *History of Dogma*. Translated from the 3d German ed. by Neil Buchanan. New York: Russell and Russell, 1958, I, 287-317, 336-64.

Hennecke, Edgar (ed.). *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*. 3d ed. revised by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959.

"The Instruction of the Vizier Ptah-hotep," trans. John A. Wilson, in James B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950), pp. 412-14.

Jackson, A. V. Williams. *Researches in Manichaeism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

James, Montague Rhodes. *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. Translated by S. H. Hooke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.

______. *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller. London: SPCK, 1957.

Jonas, Hans. *Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist*. 2. durchgesehene Auflage. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954.

______. *The Gnostic Religion*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.

Keck, Leander Earl. *The Sojourn of the Savior, The Use of the Life of Jesus in Christian Gnosticism*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School of Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, 1957.

Knox, Wilfred L. *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.

Legge, Francis. *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1915.

Liddell, George Henry, and Scott, Robert. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 2 vols. 9th ed., revised by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Lietzmann, Hans. *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. 3rd ed. revised. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.

Lock, Walter, and Sanday, William. *Two Lectures on the 'Sayings of Jesus' Recently Discovered at Oxyrhynchus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.

Malinine, Michel (ed.). *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*. Boston: The Byzantine Institute, Inc., 1950, 91-154.

Manson, T. W. *The Sayings of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1949.

Midrash Rabbah. Edited by H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. London: Soncino Press, 1939. Vols. II and VI.

Mielziner, Moses. "Pirke Abot," The Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1901, I, 81-82.

Montefiore, C. G. The Synoptic Gospels. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1909.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Nock, A. D. (ed.), and Festugière, A. J. (trans.). Corpus Hermeticum. 2 vols. Paris: Societe d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1945.

Norris, John Massillon. The Functional New Testament of Clement of Alexandria. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1942.

Notes for the Nile. Translated by Hardwicke D. Rawnsley. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1892.

Novum Testamentum Graece. Edited by Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle. 21st ed. Stuttgart: Privileg. Wurtt. Bibelanstalt, 1952.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Edited and translated by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898 and 1904, Vols. I and IV.

The Paradise of the Holy Fathers. Translated by Ernest A. Wallis Budge. 2 vols. New York: Duffield and Co., 1909.

Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca. Edited by J. P. Migne. 161 vols. Lutetia Parisiorum, 1857-66.

Patrick, John. "Rest," A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911, IV, 230.

Pistis Sophia, A Gnostic Miscellany. Translated by G. R. S. Mead. London: J. M. Watkins, 1921.

Plumley, J. Martin. An Introductory Coptic Grammar. London: Home and van Thal, 1948.

Pourrat, Pierre. Christian Spirituality. Translated by W. H. Mitchell and S. P. Jacques. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1953, Vol. I.

Puech, Henri-Charles. Le Manichéisme. Paris: Civilisations du Sud, 1949.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. 2 vols. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1953.

Reitzenstein, Richard. *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*. Dritte Auflage. Leipzig: Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1927.

Resch, Alfred. *Agrapha. Aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente*. Vol. XV: *Texte und Untersuchungen*. 2d ed. Leipzig, 1906.

Richardson, Cyril C. *Early Christian Fathers*. Vol. I: *The Library of Christian Classics*. 26 vols. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.

Roberts, Alexander, and Donaldson, James (eds.). *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. 9 vols. American reprint of the Edinburgh Edition. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951, 1956.

Sanday, William. *The Gospels in the Second Century*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1876.

Schlier, Heinrich. *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen*. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Toepelmann, 1929.

Scott, Walter (ed., trans., comm.). *Hermetica*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924-36.

Schmithals, Walter. *Die Gnosis in Korinth*. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.

Schonfield, Hugh J. *According to the Hebrews*. London: Duckworth, 1937.

Selections from the Commentaries and Homilies of Origen. Translated by R. B. Tollinton. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929.

Skinner, J. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*. In *The Cambridge Bible*. Edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick. 2d ed. revised. Cambridge: University Press, 1951 reprint.

Smith, Joseph P. (trans.). *St. Ireneaus, Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*. Vol. XVI: *Ancient Christian Writers*. Edited by Johannes Quasten and Joseph C. Plumpe. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1952.

Steffes, Johann Peter. *Das Wesen des Gnostizismus und sein Verhaeltnis zum katholischen Dogma*: Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schoeningh, 1922.

Steindorff, Georg. Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Stewart, A. "Mystery," A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911, III, 465-69.

Taylor, Charles. The Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.

Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel according to St. Mark. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1952.

Till, Walter C. Koptische Grammatik, Saidischer Dialekt. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1955.

Vaganay, Leon. Le Probleme Synoptique. Tournai, Belg.: Desclec & Co., 1954.

Westcott, B. F. A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament. London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.

White, Hugh G. Evelyn. The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhynchus. Cambridge: University Press, 1920.

Wilson, R. McL. The Gnostic Problem. London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, Ltd., 1958.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. Philo. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947, Vol. I.

Workman, Herbert B. The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal. London: The Epworth Press, 1927.

The Works of Philo Judaeus. Translated by C. D. Yonge. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855, Vol. IV.

The Works of Plato. Translated by Benjamin Jowett and edited by Irwin Edman. New York: The Modern Library, 1928.

Articles and Letters

Badham, F. P., and Conybeare, F. C. "Fragments of an Ancient (?Egyptian) Gospel Used by the Cathars of Albia," Hibbert Journal, XI (1913), 805-18.

Bouyer, Louis. "Gnosis: Le sens orthodoxe de l'expression jusqu'aux pères alexandrins," Journal of Theological Studies, IV (October, 1953), 188-203.

Casey, R. P. "Naassenes and Ophites," Journal of Theological Studies, XXVII (1925-26), 374-87.

______. "The Study of Gnosticism," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVI (1935), 45-60.

Cersoy, P. "Quelques Remarques sur les Logia de Behnesa," Revue Biblique, VII (July, 1898), 415-20.

Crum, Walter Ewing. "Coptic Anecdota," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV (1943), 178-82.

Doresse, Jean. "Trois livres gnostiques inédits," Vigilae Christianae, II (1948), 137-60.

______, and Mina, Togo. "Nouveaux texts gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute-Egypte," Vigiliae Christianae, iii (1949), 129-41.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Oxyrhynchus Logoi of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas," Theological Studies, XX (December, 1959), 505-60.

Gold, Victor Roland. "The Gnostic Library of Chenoboskion," The Biblical Archaeologist, XV (December, 1952), 70-88.

Grant, Robert M. "Notes on the Gospel of Thomas," Vigiliae Christianae, XIII (September, 1959), 170-80.

______. "Two Gnostic Gospels," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIX (March, 1960), 1-11.

Grobel, Kendrick. Personal Letter from Bangalore, South India, October 17, 1959.

______. Personal Letter from Bangalore, South India, February 2, 1960.

Lagrange, M. J. "L'Evangile selon less Hebreux," Revue Biblique, XXXI (April, 1922), 161-81.

Leipoldt, Johannes. "Ein neues Evangelium?" Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXIII (July, 1958), cols. 482-95.

MacRae, George W. "The Gospel of Thomas--Logia Iesou?" The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXII (January, 1960), 56-70.

Mina, Togo. "Le papyrus gnostique du Musée Copte," Vigiliae Christianae, II (1948), 129-36.

Piper, Otto A. "The Gospel of Thomas," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIII (October, 1959), 18-24.

______. "A New Gospel?" *The Christian Century*, LXXVII (January 27, 1960), 96-99.

Plooy, D. "A Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron in Greek," *Expository Times*, XLVI (1934-35), 471-76.

Prigent, Pierre. "Ce que l'oeil n'a pas vu, I Cor. 2, 9," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XIV (November-December, 1958), 416-29.

______. "L'évangile selon Thomas État de la question," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses*, XXXIX (1959), 39-45.

Puech, Henri-Charles. "Un logion de Jesus sur bandélette funeraire," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, CXLVII (1955), 126-29.

Quispel, Gilles. "L'Évangile selon Thomas et les Clémentines," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XI (December, 1958), 181-96.

______. "L'Évangile selon Thomas et le Diatessaron," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XIII (July, 1959), 87-117.

______. "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XI (December, 1957), 189-207.

______. "Das Hebraerevangelium im gnostischen Evangelium nach Maria," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XI (September, 1957), 139-44.

______. "Some Remarks on the Gospel of Thomas," *New Testament Studies*, V (July, 1959), 276-90.

Schoeps, H. J. "Ebionite Christianity," Translated by R. H. Lightfoot, *Journal of Theological Studies*, IV (October, 1953), 219-24.

Taylor, Richard E. "The 'Gospel of Thomas': Gnosticism and the New Testament," *Christianity Today*, IV (January, 1960), 303-05.

Till, Walter C. "The Apocryphon of John," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, III (1952), 14-22.

______. "New Sayings of Jesus in the Recently Discovered Coptic 'Gospel of Thomas,'" *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XLI (1959), 446-58.

Wilson, R. McLean. "The Coptic 'Gospel of Thomas,'" *New Testament Studies*, V (July, 1959), 273-76.